Calendar No. 713

99TH CONGRESS
2d Session

SENATE

REPORT
99-331

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1987

REPORT

[TO ACCOMPANY S. 2638]

ON

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE MILITARY FUNCTIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND TO PRESCRIBE PERSONNEL LEVELS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1987, TO AUTHORIZE CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR, TO AUTHORIZE APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY FOR NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

together with

ADDITIONAL AND MINORITY VIEWS

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
UNITED STATES SENATE

JULY 8, 1986.—Ordered to be printed

Filed, under authority of the order of the Senate of June 27 (legislative day, June 23), 1986

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
61-270 O
WASHINGTON : 1986

1

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

BARRY GOLDWATER, Arizona, *Chairman*

STROM THURMOND, South Carolina
JOHN W. WARNER, Virginia
GORDON J. HUMPHREY, New Hampshire
WILLIAM S. COHEN, Maine
DAN QUAYLE, Indiana
JOHN P. EAST, North Carolina
PETE WILSON, California
JEREMIAH DENTON, Alabama
PHIL GRAMM, Texas

SAM NUNN, Georgia
JOHN C. STENNIS, Mississippi
GARY HART, Colorado
J. JAMES EXON, Nebraska
CARL LEVIN, Michigan
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico
ALAN J. DIXON, Illinois
JOHN GLENN, Ohio

JAMES F. MCGOVERN, *Staff Director and Chief Counsel*
ARNOLD L. PUNARO, *Staff Director for the Minority*
PATRICK A. TUCKER, *General Counsel*
CHRISTINE C. DAUTH, *Chief Clerk*

CONTENTS

Page
Purpose of the bill 1
Budget impact of the committee bill 2
Summary of funds and manpower authorized in committee bill 3
Summary of funds recommended for authorization 4
Prior year savings 7
Highlights of committee action 9
  Procurement 9
  Research and development 10
  Operation and maintenance 11
  Manpower 11
  Summary of notifications, reports or studies requested 11
Authorization modifications due to subsequent budgetary actions 12
Division A—Department of Defense Authorization 13
Title I—Procurement 13
Background on procurement authorization 13
Summary of recommended funding changes 13
Summary of adjustments to fiscal year 1987 procurement authorization request 13
  Aircraft procurement, Army 14
    Acquisition plans for major Army systems 16
    EH-60 Quick Fix II 16
    AH-64 (Apache) attack helicopter 17
    UH-60 Blackhawk helicopter 17
  Missile procurement, Army 18
    Stinger 20
    TOW II 20
  Procurement of weapons and tracked combat vehicles, Army 22
    Bradley fighting vehicle 25
    M-1 Abrams main battle tank 26
    9mm handgun 26
  Procurement of ammunition, Army 27
    Lightweight multi-purpose system 32
    Binary chemical modernization program 32
    Chemical deterrent program 33
    Bigeye 35
    Demilitarization program 35
    Protective mask 36
    Recommendation 36
  Other procurement, Army 37
    Mobile subscriber equipment 49
    Single channel ground and airborne radio system (SINCGARS) 49
  Aircraft procurement, Navy 51
    A-6E/F (Intruder) 55
    EA-6B (Prowler) electronic countermeasures aircraft 55
    F-14 (Tomcat) fighter aircraft 55
    F/A-18 (Hornet) fighter/attack aircraft 55
    AH-1W 56
    ASW aircraft 56
    P-3C aircraft procurement 56
    E-2C Hawkeye 56
    P-3C modifications 56
  Weapons procurement, Navy 58
    Trident II 62
    Tomahawk 62

Page

Summary of adjustments to fiscal year 1987 procurement authorization request—Continued

Weapons procurement, Navy—Continued

- AIM-7M Sparrow ... 63
- AIM-9M Sidewinder ... 63
- AIM-54C Phoenix missile ... 63
- AGM-84 Harpoon ... 63
- Rolling airframe missile ... 64
- Weapons industrial facilities ... 64
- Small arms and weapons ... 64
- Undistributed reduction ... 64
- Consolidation of munitions ... 65

Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy ... 66
- Overview ... 68
- SSN-21 new design submarine ... 68
- DDG-51 helicopter support facilities ... 68
- Minesweeper hunter ... 68
- Prior year savings ... 69
- Format of account ... 69

Other procurement, Navy ... 70
- Sealift support ... 83
- Ordnance training equipment ... 83
- Seasheds ... 83
- MK-45 gun mount and MK-6 ammunition hoist ... 83
- OPN undistributed reduction ... 83

Procurement, Marine Corps ... 85
- Preparedness subcommittee programs ... 92
- Unit level circuit switch ... 92

Aircraft procurement, Air Force ... 93
- Air defense fighter competition ... 97
- F-15 (Eagle) ... 97
- F-16 (Falcon) ... 97
- MC-130 (Combat Talon) ... 97
- C-17 airlifter ... 97
- B-52 modifications ... 98
- C-135 modifications ... 98
- Prior year savings ... 98

Missile procurement, Air Force ... 99
- AIM-7M Sparrow ... 102
- AIM-9M Sidewinder ... 102
- AGM-65D IRR Maverick ... 102
- AMRAAM (advanced medium range air-to-air missile) ... 102
- Defense support program (DSP) ... 103
- Space Boosters ... 103

Other procurement, Air Force ... 105
- Preparedness subcommittee programs ... 116
- 30mm GAU-8 ammunition ... 116

Procurement, Defense Agencies ... 117
- Major equipment, OSD/WHS ... 119

National Guard and Reserve Equipment, Defense ... 120

DOD chemical demilitarization program ... 123
- Authorization for multiyear contracts ... 124

Title II—Research, Development, Test and Evaluation ... 125

Background on research and development authorization ... 125

Summary of recommended funding changes ... 125

Summary of adjustments to fiscal year 1987 RDT&E authorization request ... 125

Research, development, test & evaluation, Army ... 126
- Applied optics university research ... 135
- LHX—Aircraft propulsion systems/advanced rotorcraft technology integration ... 135
- M-1 diesel alternative ... 135
- Remotely piloted vehicles (Aquila) ... 136
- Advanced field artillery tactical data system/Marine integrated fire and air support system ... 137
- Airlift for special operations forces ... 138
- Real property maintenance and base operations support ... 138
- Multipurpose 20mm ammunition ... 139
- Ground launched Hellfire missile ... 139

Page

Summary of adjustments to fiscal year 1987 RDT&E authorization request—Continued

- Research, development, test & evaluation, Navy ... 140
  - Ship propulsion system/racer ... 151
  - Advanced air-to-surface missile ... 151
  - Surface mine countermeasures ... 151
  - Surface ASW systems ... 151
  - ALWT (advanced) ... 152
  - Merchant ship naval auxiliary program ... 152
  - Penguin/LAMPS ... 152
  - P-3 modernization ... 153
  - V-22A Osprey ... 153
  - Mark-92 fire control system upgrade ... 153
  - Rolling airframe missile ... 153
  - Seafire ... 154
  - F/A-18 squadrons ... 154
  - Naval oceanography program ... 154
  - Marine Corps RDT&E undistributed reduction ... 155
  - Undistributed reduction ... 155
  - Real property maintenance and base operation support ... 155
- Research, development, test & evaluation, Air Force ... 156
  - Ground collision avoidance equipment ... 166
  - Hypervelocity/kinetic energy weapon ... 166
  - Advanced strategic missile system ... 166
  - SRAM II ... 167
  - ICBM modernization ... 168
    - Peacekeeper ... 168
    - Small ICBM ... 168
    - Follow-on basing ... 169
    - ICBM modernization ... 170
  - Space Defense System (ASAT) ... 170
  - Minuteman squadrons ... 171
  - MILSTAR ... 172
  - Advanced tactical fighter (ATF)/Advanced tactical aircraft (ATA) ... 172
  - C-17 airlifter ... 173
  - AMRAAM (advanced medium range air-to-air missile) ... 173
  - Precision location strike system ... 173
  - Joint surveillance and target acquisition radar system (JSTARS) ... 174
  - Joint programs for conventional defense ... 174
  - MAC command & control system ... 174
  - A-7 Strikefighter ... 174
  - Real property maintenance and base operations support ... 175
  - Space shuttle operations ... 175
- Research, development, test & evaluation, Defense Agencies ... 176
  - Strategic technology ... 180
  - SDI and a balanced technology initiative ... 180
  - Strategic defense initiative funding ... 180

Title III—Operation and Maintenance ... 186
- O&M summary table ... 186
  - Summary ... 186
  - Financing adjustments ... 187
  - Personnel ... 187
  - O&M, Army ... 187
  - O&M, Navy ... 188
  - O&M, Marine Corps ... 188
  - O&M, Air Force ... 188
  - O&M, Defense Agencies ... 189
  - O&M, Army Reserve ... 189
  - O&M, Navy Reserve ... 189
  - O&M, Marine Corps Reserve ... 189
  - O&M, Air Force Reserve ... 190
  - O&M, Army National Guard ... 190
  - O&M, Air National Guard ... 190
  - O&M, National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice ... 190
  - Claims, Defense ... 190
  - Court of Military Appeals, Defense ... 191
  - Environmental Restoration Fund, Defense ... 191
  - Pan American Games, 1987 ... 191

Title III—Operation and Maintenance—Continued

Page

O&M summary table—Continued

- Afghanistan aid 192
- All O&M tables 194

Other provisions 204
- Readiness reporting 204
- Navy ship overhaul policy 205
- Prohibition on use of funds for certain studies 205

Revolving and management funds 205

Special foreign currency 206

Title IV—Personnel Authorization and Related Items 207

Part A, Active Forces 207
- Background on active forces authorization 207
- Force structure considerations 207
- Summary of major force elements 208
- Active duty end strengths 210
- Quality of military personnel 210
- Active duty officer corps strength 210

Part B, Reserve Forces 211
- Background on reserve forces authorization 211
- Selected reserve average strengths 212
- Full-time support in the reserve components 212
- Counting of personnel in certain reserve call-up situations 213
- Accounting for certain reserve members within personnel authorization 213

Part C, Civilian Personnel 214
- Background on civilian personnel authorization 214
- Categories of civilians 214
- End strength management 215
- Fiscal year 1987 civilian end strength 216
- Reports relating to proposed increased civilian personnel utilization 216

Part D, Military Training Student Loads 216
- Background on military training student loads authorization 216
- Military training student loads authorization 217

Part E, Manpower Analyses 218
- Manpower reports on major defense acquisition programs 218

Title V—Military Personnel Policy 219
- Assignment of personnel outside the United States 219
- Treatment of excess leave at reenlistment 219
- Extension of Navy spot promotion authority 219
- Clarification of authority to retain Army Reserve brigadier generals in active status until age 60 220
- Increased Presidential authority to augment active forces with the Selected Reserve 220
- Involuntary order to active duty of reserve personnel in captive status 221
- Technical correction relating to personnel administration at Air Force Institute of Technology 221
- Termination of gender-based distinctions in promotions, of officers in the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve 222
- Senate confirmation of certain general officer positions 222
- Position of Staff Judge Advocate to the Commandant of the Marine Corps 223
- Temporary increase in the number of general and flag officers authorized to be on active duty in certain grades 223

Title VI—Compensation and Other Personnel Benefits 225

Part A, Basic pay and allowances 225
- Military pay raise for fiscal year 1987 225
- Reimbursement for accommodations in place of quarters 225
- Advance pay for senior ROTC members in certain circumstances 225
- Termination of pay inequity between officers and personnel formerly enlisted in certain health professions training 226

Part B, Travel and transportation 227
- Improved dislocation allowance 227
- Overseas transportation of privately owned vehicles 228
- Transportation and storage of household goods 229
- Contingent authorization for flat rate per diem system 229
- Travel expenses for dependents overseas who require medical care in certain circumstances 230
- Authorization limit on funds for PCS travel 230

Page

Title VI—Compensation and Other Personnel Benefits—Continued

- Part C, Bonuses and special and incentive pays 231
  - Enhanced aviation officer continuation pay (AOCP) 231
  - Inclusion of aviation cadets under aviation career incentive pay (ACIP) program 231
  - Payment of Selected Reserve enlistment bonus 232
  - Special pay for members proficient in foreign languages 233
  - Special pay for board certified psychologists 233
- Part D, Miscellaneous benefits 234
  - Improved death gratuity 234
  - Authority to pay bank charge in the event of government error in mandatory direct deposit of pay situations. 235
  - Transportation and medical care for dependents of certain sentenced, discharged, and dismissed members 235
  - Improved employment opportunities of military spouses 237
  - Retirement credit for certain former National Guard technicians 237
  - Death and disability benefits for Reserve component members 238
  - Authorization for members of the Selected Reserve to have limited use of commissary stores 240
- Part E, Administration of personnel benefits 240
  - Accounting for payments of claims of benefits 240
  - Enhanced method for determining true costs of military retirement 240

Title VII—Health Care 243
- Alternative health care plans 243
- Confidentiality of medical quality assurance records 245
- Registration of health care professionals 246
- Dental insurance program 247
- Dental care for dependents on accompanied tours overseas 247
- Vietnam POW health follow-up studies 248

Title VIII—Military Justice 249
- Military confinement system 250

Title IX—Defense Acquisition Reorganization and Improvements Act 253
- Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition 254
- Defense enterprise programs 256
- Private employment contacts by certain Department of Defense officials 260
- Commercial pricing for spare or repair parts 261
- Regulations for allocating overhead to parts to which the contractor has added little value 264
- Repeal of cost and price management provisions 264
- Application of requirement to mark supplies to identify suppliers and sources 265
- Nondevelopment items 265
- Requirements relating to other than competitive procedures 266
- Evaluation facts in award of contracts 266
- Offsets for contracts adjustments relating to defective cost and pricing data 267
- Alternative personnel management system 268
- Foreign policy and national security consideration in defense contracting 270
- DOD FAR suppplement 272

Title X—Department of Defense Efficiency and Economy Matters 274
- Davis-Bacon Act 274
- Service Contracting Act 274
- Contracting out provisions 277

Title XI—National Defense Stockpile 279

Title XII—General Provisions 281
- General authorization of appropriations for pay raises, fuel costs, and inflation adjustments 281
- Excess funding report 281
- Revising selected acquisition reports 281
- Counterintelligence polygraph program 282
- Purchase of alcoholic beverages for resale 283
- Modernization of NATO's southern flank 284
- Cooperative logistics arrangements in NATO 284
- Cooperative projects 285
- Acquisition and cross-service agreements 285
- Cooperative research and developments with non-NATO allies and other friendly countries 287
- Arms control provisions 287

Title XII—General Provisions—Continued

Page
Federally funded Research and Development Center for strategic defense initiative 287
Special defense acquisition fund 288
Extension of authority of the Secretary of Defense to transport humanitarian relief supplies 289
Humanitarian and civic assistance activities 289
Authority to pay or defray incremental expenses for foreign country participation in combined exercises 290
Payment of certain expenses of foreign defense personnel 291
Report on DOD participation in U.S. drug interdiction efforts 291
Reporting of terrorist threats 292
Budget-related matters 292
    Budgeting for inflation 292
    Two-year budgets 293
Intelligence-related matters 295
    Communications security 295
    Improved DOD security/Stilwell Commission 295
Cooperation with NATO allies 296
Division B—Military Construction Authorization 297
Purpose of Division B 297
Authorization for appropriations granted, fiscal year 1987 298
Background 299
Summary of committee action 299
Areas of special interest 299
Composite authorizations 300
Minor construction 300
Installation master planning 301
Base closure 302
Philippine bases 302
Section 6 schools 302
Child care centers 303
Third party contracting 303
Restrictions on conversion of heating facilities at United States military installations in Europe 304
Improved flexibility of defense facilities fuel selection 304
Military housing build to lease (801) and rental guarantee (802) programs. 305
Brigs 305
Title I—Army 307
    Light Infantry Divisions 321
    Dual authorization of Army ammunition plant projects 322
    Galveston Island 322
    Fort Chafee, Arkansas 322
    Fortifications in Germany 322
Title II—Navy 324
    Strategic homeporting 342
    Broadway complex, San Diego 343
Title III—Air Force 344
    Myrtle Beach Air Force Base 366
Title IV—Defense Agencies 367
    Rocky Mountain Arsenal 373
    Brooke Army Medical Center 374
    Kirtland Air Force Base Clinic 375
    Pentagon Complex 375
Title V—North Atlantic Treaty Organization Infrastructure NATO Authorization 376
Title VI—Guard and Reserve Forces Facilities 377
    National Guard Center 379
Title VII—General Provisions 379
    Establishment of certain amounts required to be specified by law 379
    Construction of postal facilities 380
    Establish "renovation" as a new category of work 380
    Overseas high cost family housing leases 380
    Hazardous waste storage facilities 380
    Planning and design 380
    Sale and replacement of real property 381
Division C—Department of Energy national security and military applications of nuclear energy authorization 382

Page

Division C—Department of Energy national security and military applications of nuclear energy authorization—Continued

- Summary of committee recommendations 382
  - Committee hearings 382
- Operating expenses 382
  - Weapons activities 382
  - Materials production 383
  - Naval reactors development 384
- Plant construction 384
- Capital equipment 385
  - Weapons activities 385
- Undistributed reductions 385
  - Nuclear weapons council 385
- Authorization recommended 386
- Summary of changes—fiscal year 1987 Department of Energy programs 387

Division D—Civil Defense 398
- Fiscal year 1987 Civil Defense program 398

Departmental recommendations 399
Committee action 449
Fiscal data 450
Congressional Budget Office letter and estimate 452
Congressional action on procurement, RDT&E, operation and maintenance, working capital funds, special foreign currency, and civil defense authorization request 458
Relationship of annual authorization to Department of Defense appropriations 460
Regulatory impact 462
Changes in existing law 462
Minority views of Messrs. Goldwater, Thurmond, Warner, Humphrey, Quayle, East, Wilson, Denton, and Gramm, on the Strategic Defense Initiative Program 463
Additional views of Mr. Cohen 468
Additional views of Mr. Hart 470
Additional views of Mr. Exon 473
Additional views of Mr. Levin 475
Additional views of Mr. Kennedy 482
Additional views of Mr. Bingaman 487

99TH CONGRESS
2nd Session

SENATE

REPORT
99-331

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE MILITARY FUNCTIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND TO PRESCRIBE PERSONNEL LEVELS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1987, TO AUTHORIZE CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR, TO AUTHORIZE APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY FOR NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

JULY 8, 1986.—Ordered to be printed

Filed, under authority of the order of the Senate of June 27 (legislative day, June 23), 1986

Mr. GOLDWATER, from the Committee on Armed Services, submitted the following

REPORT

together with

ADDITIONAL AND MINORITY VIEWS

[To accompany S. 2638]

The Committee on Armed Services reports favorably an original bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1987 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, and other weapons, and research, development, test and evaluation, and operation and maintenance for the Armed Forces, and revolving and management funds, for civil defense, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength for each active duty component and the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces and the military training student loads, and for other purposes, and, recommends that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill would:

(1) authorize appropriations for (a) procurement, (b) research, development, test and evaluation, (c) operation and maintenance and the revolving and management funds of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1987;

(2) authorize the personnel end strength for each military active duty component of the Armed Forces for fiscal year 1987;

(3) authorize the personnel average strengths for the Selected Reserve of each of the reserve components of the Armed Forces for fiscal year 1987;

(4) authorize civilian end strengths for each military department of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1987;

(5) authorize the annual average military training student loads for each of the active and reserve components of the Armed Forces for fiscal year 1987;

(6) impose certain reporting requirements;

(7) impose certain limitations with regard to specific procurement and RDT&E actions and manpower strengths; provide certain additional legislative authority, make certain changes to existing law, and for other purposes;

(8) authorize appropriations for military construction programs of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1987;

(9) authorize appropriations for national security programs of the Department of Energy for fiscal year 1987; and

(10) authorize appropriations for civil defense, including programs of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, for fiscal year 1987.

BUDGET IMPACT OF THE COMMITTEE BILL

The administration's request for the national defense function of the federal budget for fiscal year 1987 is $320.2 billion in budget authority. Of this $242.9 billion is requested for programs which require authorization. These programs include procurement, research and development, operation and maintenance, revolving and management funds, special foreign currency, military construction and family housing, weapons programs of the Department of Energy, and civil defense. The bill reported by the committee includes a recommendation of approximately $225.7 billion for the above accounts, a reduction of $17.1 billion from the President's request.

The funding included in the bill may appear to be substantially less than the functional ceiling for national defense. The primary reason for this difference is that, although military and civilian personnel end strengths require authorization in this bill, the actual funding for military pay and benefits (approximately $74 billion) is not reflected in this legislation. Factors which are not included in this bill, such as financing adjustments and related agency budgets, also contribute to the difference between the authorization bill total and the defense function total.

Actions of the committee to reduce military and civilian personnel end strengths and to report legislative provisions relating to personnel benefits, contract regulations, and other matters result in a further reduction from the President's request of approximately $2.0 billion. Therefore, the net impact of the bill on the administration's request for national defense is a reduction of approximately $19.2 billion. This level of funding is consistent with the budget authority funding level contained in the First Concurrent Budget Resolution agreed to in the Senate on May 1, 1986 (S. Con. Res. 120).

An overall summary of the funding and manpower provisions of the bill follows:

SUMMARY OF FUNDS AND MANPOWER
AUTHORIZED IN COMMITTEE BILL

(Dollar amounts in thousands; totals may not add due to rounding)

	FY 87 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
Procurement	95,746,800	-5,898,231	89,848,569
RDT&E	41,929,900	-4,690,706	37,239,194
Operation and Maintenance	85,773,000	-4,554,141	81,218,859
Revolving and Management Funds	1,197,300	-100,000	1,097,300
Special Foreign Currency	3,500	0	3,500
Military Construction/Family Housing	9,987,138	-1,184,110	8,803,028
DOE Weapons Programs	8,098,400	-673,175	7,425,225
Civil Defense	126,565	-15,000	111,565
Base Closure Commission	0	1,000	1,000
Revision of Davis-Bacon	---	-28,000	-28,000
TOTAL FUNDING	242,862,603	-17,142,363	225,720,240
MANPOWER:			
Active Duty	2,181,100	-6,850	2,174,250
Selected Reserve	1,164,100	-60,524	1,103,576
Civilians	1,114,616	-29,780	1,084,836
TOTAL MANPOWER	4,459,816	-97,154	4,362,662

SUMMARY OF FUNDS RECOMMENDED FOR AUTHORIZATION
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 1986 FINAL	FY 1987 REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
			CHANGE FROM REQUEST	RECOMMENDATION
PROCUREMENT				
Army:				
Aircraft	3,524,200	3,264,700	-279,100	2,985,600
Missiles	2,904,332	2,438,200	-83,300	2,354,900
Weapons & Tracked Combat Vehicles	4,676,800	4,452,600	-351,600	4,101,000
Ammunition	2,497,200	2,254,000	88,800	2,342,800
Other Procurement	5,240,256	6,169,000	-609,700	5,559,300
Total, Army Procurement	18,842,788	18,578,500	-1,234,900	17,343,600
Navy:				
Aircraft	11,175,678	11,304,300	-752,230	10,552,070
Weapons	5,216,095	6,095,400	-189,510	5,905,890
Shipbuilding and Conversion	10,840,400	11,046,200	-1,131,600	9,914,600
Other Procurement	6,381,282	6,538,800	-417,143	6,121,657
Marine Corps	1,660,766	1,565,000	-88,000	1,477,000
Total, Navy Procurement	35,274,221	36,549,700	-2,578,483	33,971,217
Air Force:				
Aircraft	23,030,524	19,127,400	-1,642,496	17,484,904
Missiles	8,317,042	8,982,400	-371,000	8,611,400
Other Procurement	8,568,083	10,900,300	-525,452	10,374,848
Total, Air Force Procurement	39,915,649	39,010,100	-2,538,948	36,471,152
Defense Agencies Procurement	1,287,740	1,488,400	-10,900	1,477,500
National Guard & Reserve Proc	1,501,800	0	465,000	465,000
DOD NATO Cooperative Programs	15,000	0	0	0
Coastal Defense Augmentation	235,000	0	0	0
DOD Chemical Demilitarization Prog	0	120,100	0	120,100
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT	97,072,198	95,746,800	-5,898,231	89,848,569
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION				
Army	4,841,472	5,550,300	-610,831	4,939,469
Navy (including Marine Corps)	10,076,939	10,586,800	-1,095,822	9,490,978
Air Force	13,787,408	17,275,400	-1,973,727	15,301,673
Defense Agencies	6,642,386	8,364,300	-1,010,326	7,353,974
Director, Test and Evaluation	118,500	141,800	0	141,800
Director, Oper Test and Evaluation	0	11,300	0	11,300
TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION	35,466,705	41,929,900	-4,690,706	37,239,194

	FY 1986 FINAL	FY 1987 REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION CHANGE FROM REQUEST	RECOMMENDATION
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE				
Army	19,097,557	21,341,870	-677,800	20,664,070
Navy	24,514,719	25,688,500	-1,412,540	24,275,960
Marine Corps	1,612,050	1,864,100	-30,000	1,834,100
Air Force	19,620,538	21,214,500	-1,796,129	19,418,371
Defense Agencies	7,600,894	8,573,700	-240,772	8,332,928
Army Reserve	780,100	793,100	-14,800	778,300
Naval Reserve	894,950	975,900	-69,900	906,000
Marine Corps Reserve	57,200	65,300	-2,300	63,000
Air Force Reserve	902,700	975,600	-70,800	904,800
Army National Guard	1,652,800	1,786,900	-64,100	1,722,800
Air National Guard	1,806,200	1,932,700	-158,000	1,774,700
Rifle Practice, Defense	920	930	0	930
Claims, Defense	143,300	155,600	-11,500	144,100
Court of Military Appeals, Defense	3,200	3,400	-200	3,200
Pan American Games	10,000	15,000	0	15,000
Environmental Restoration Fund	(379,100)	385,900	-15,300	370,600
Afghanistan Aid	0	0	10,000	10,000
TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	78,697,128	85,773,000	-4,554,141	81,218,859
REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS				
Army Stock Fund	393,000	296,700	-25,000	271,700
Navy Stock Fund	638,500	478,500	-40,000	438,500
Marine Corps Stock Fund	37,700	45,900	-4,000	41,900
Air Force Stock Fund	415,900	239,400	-20,000	219,400
Defense Stock Fund	91,700	136,800	-11,000	125,800
ADP Management Fund	100,000	0	0	0
TOTAL, REVOLVING AND MGMT FUNDS	1,676,800	1,197,300	-100,000	1,097,300
SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY	2,100	3,500	0	3,500
TOTAL	212,914,931	224,650,500	-15,243,078	209,407,422

			COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
	FY 1986 FINAL	FY 1987 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	RECOMMENDATION
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION				
Army	1,685,672	1,698,570	-306,560	1,392,010
Navy/Marine Corps	1,669,445	1,795,380	-296,120	1,499,260
Air Force	1,759,093	1,702,820	-327,340	1,375,480
Defense Agencies	238,295	674,600	-104,710	569,890
Army National Guard	149,101	121,100	0	121,100
Air National Guard	139,000	140,000	0	140,000
Army Reserve	70,700	86,700	0	86,700
Naval Reserve	51,800	44,500	0	44,500
Air Force Reserve	70,650	58,900	0	58,900
NATO Infrastructure	38,000	247,000	0	247,000
TOTAL, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION	5,871,756	6,569,570	-1,034,730	5,534,840
FAMILY HOUSING				
Army	1,627,131	1,740,646	-88,050	1,652,596
Navy	738,739	792,913	-55,330	737,583
Air Force	941,898	860,409	-6,000	854,409
Defense Agencies	20,300	17,600	0	17,600
Homeowners Assistance Fund	0	6,000	0	6,000
TOTAL, FAMILY HOUSING	3,328,068	3,417,568	-149,380	3,268,188
TOTAL, MIL CON & FAMILY HOUSING	9,199,824	9,987,138	-1,184,110	8,803,028
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS				
Operating Expenses	6,017,887	6,523,694	-202,175	6,321,519
Plant Construction	938,541	1,027,241	-136,000	891,241
Capital Equipment	462,387	547,465	-35,000	512,465
Adjustments	0	0	-300,000	-300,000
TOTAL, DOE PROGRAMS	7,418,815	8,098,400	-673,175	7,425,225
FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRAM	130,815	126,565	-15,000	111,565
BASE CLOSURE COMMISSION	0	0	1,000	1,000
REVISION OF DAVIS-BACON	0	0	-28,000	-28,000
GRAND TOTAL OF BILL	229,664,385	242,862,603	-17,142,363	225,720,240

PRIOR YEAR SAVINGS

The committee has identified several accounts in which funds appropriated in prior years are no longer necessary, and the committee recommends that these funds be used to offset program requirements in the fiscal year 1987 budget. The committee is concerned, however, that statutory transfers of such amounts in this authorization bill would limit the flexibility of the Committee on Appropriations in using funds available from prior years to fashion a defense appropriations bill which complies with the funding targets contained in a fiscal year 1987 budget resolution.

Therefore, the committee has not recommended statutory provisions to effect the transfer of funds from prior years. Instead, general reductions have been made to the affected accounts, with the intent of allowing prior year funds to be applied as necessary by the Appropriations Committee. The committee intends to work closely with the Committee on Appropriations in allocating these funding sources.

The following table identifies the sources of available funds which the committee feels should be transferred and applied to fiscal year 1987 funding requirements.

PRIOR YEAR SAVINGS
(Dollars in millions)

ACCOUNT	AMOUNT OF SAVINGS
Army Aircraft Procurement (FY 86/88):	
Aircraft spares	$47.200
Army Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles (FY 86/88):	
Bradley fighting vehicles	38.800
Navy Aircraft Procurement (FY 86/88):	
A-6E attack aircraft	0.800
EA-6B electronic warfare aircraft	1.000
E-2C early warning aircraft	1.300
SH-2F ASW helicopter	3.332
Aircraft spares	74.000
Navy Shipbuilding and Conversion (FY 86/90):	188.600
Navy Other Procurement (FY 86/88):	
Radiological controls	0.147
Pollution control equipment	0.900
Elect Suspended Gyro Nav	0.500
Submarine Silencing Equipment	6.900
Other Navigation Equipment	0.500
AN/SSQ-77 (VLAD)	3.828
Weapons Range Support Equipment	3.149
Defense Nuclear Agency material	0.076
Marine Corps Procurement (FY 86/88):	
Spares and repair parts	9.000
Air Force Aircraft Procurement (FY 86/88):	
T-46A trainer aircraft	169.936
Airborne Command Post Upgrade	50.000
Air Force Aircraft Procurement (FY 85-87):	
C-5B	117.400
Air Force Missile Procurement (FY 86/88):	
Minuteman	6.800
Air Force Missile Procurement (FY 85/87):	
ASAT	61.800

HIGHLIGHTS OF COMMITTEE ACTION

PROCUREMENT

Approval of 120 AH-64 Apache helicopters, a reduction of 24 from the request.

Approval of 840 M-1 tanks, as requested.

Approval of 720 Bradley Fighting Vehicles, a reduction of 150 from the request.

Approval of $50.0 million for the procurement of Aquila RPV system, a reduction of $67.7 million from the request.

Approval of $2,267.9 million for procurement of Army ammunition, which is $200 million less than the funding level for fiscal year 1986.

Approval of 11 A-6E/F Intruder attack aircraft, as requested.

Approval of 42 AV-8B Harrier aircraft, as requested.

Approval of 96 F/A-18 Hornet fighter aircraft, a reduction of 24 from the request.

Approval of two TICONDEROGA (CG-47) class Aegis cruisers and three ARLEIGH BURKE (DDG-51) class Aegis destroyers, as requested.

Approval of four LOS ANGELES (SSN-688) class submarines, as requested.

Approval of one OHIO (SSBN-726) class Trident ballistic missile submarine.

Reduction of $612.7 million for one AOE multi-product auxiliary ship.

Reduction of $196.1 million for 4 MSH-1 minesweeper hunter ships.

Approval for use of up to $100 million in prior year savings to acquire two MSH-X minesweeper hunters from a shipbuilder in an allied nation.

Termination of LAMPS Mark I (SH-2F) helicopter production.

Approval of 17 LAMPS Mark III helicopters, 7 SH-60F CV ASW helicopters, and 9 P-3C patrol aircraft, as requested.

Undistributed reduction of $400 million (-6%) in the Navy Other Procurement account.

Termination of the air defense aircraft program.

Approval of 48 F-15 fighter aircraft, as requested.

Approval of 192 F-16 fighter aircraft, a reduction of 24 aircraft from the request.

Approval of 3,600 Infrared Maverick missiles, a reduction of 1,100 missiles from the request.

Approval of 260 Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAM), as requested.

Approval of funds for the final year of multiyear procurement of C-5B Galaxy aircraft.

Approval of funds for the final year of multiyear procurement of KC-10A advanced tanker/cargo aircraft.

Approval of $217.3 million for production of C-17 airlift aircraft, and approval of $547.3 million in development, a reduction of $65.0 million from the request.

Approval of $1.42 billion for the procurement of 21 MX missiles.

Approval of $1.12 billion for the procurement of 21 Trident II missiles and $.3 billion for advanced procurement.

Approval of full funding the the Advanced Technology Bomber.

Approval of full funding for the Advanced Cruise Missile.

Approval of $28.5 million for advanced procurement associated with the Miniature Homing Vehicle ASAT program.

Approval of $102.7 million for procurement and $180 million for advanced procurement of space boosters.

Approval of $666.7 million for procurement of 324 Tomahawk Sea-Launched Cruise Missiles, a reduction of $55 million reflecting anticipated contract savings, and $68.8 million for advanced procurement.

Approval of $128.6 million for procurement of 76 Ground Launched Cruise Missiles.

Approval of $1.12 billion for the chemical deterrent program, including the full amount requested for the 155mm binary artillery shell and the production of the BIGEYE air-delivered bomb.

Reduction of $158 million for modifications to the B-52 bomber fleet.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Denial of funds for P-3G aircraft development.

Approval of $70.4 million for development of Update IV avionics for P-3C aircraft.

Denial of funds for Navy Rolling Airframe Missiles (RAM) development and procurement.

Denial of funds for Navy Penguin missile development.

Denial of funds for Seafire development.

Denial of funds for Navy RACER (Rankine Cycle Energy Recovery) development.

Denial of funds for development of nuclear warheads for the Sea Lance, a submarine-launched anti-submarine rocket, and the Navy SM-2 surface-to-air missile.

Approval of $1.63 billion for the Trident II missile.

Approval of $322.3 million for MX missile development, a reduction of $30 million.

Approval of $762.5 million for development associated with the MILSTAR program, a reduction of $33.5 million.

Approval of $278 million for continued development of the Miniature Homing Vehicle ASAT program.

Approval of $138.7 million for Space Boosters.

Reduction of $1.2 billion from the Strategic Defense Initiative.

Reduction of $700 million for the Small ICBM program.

Reduction of $188 million for ICBM Follow-on basing.

Undistributed reduction of over $900 million in Navy RDT&E.

Undistributed reduction of over $350 million in Army RDT&E.

Undistributed reduction of over $675 million in Air Force RDT&E.

Undistributed reduction of over $250 million in Defense Agencies RDT&E.

Reduction of $673 million for the Department of Energy Weapons Program, including $178 million related to directed energy research for the Strategic Defense Initiative.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Approval of $81.2 billion for operation and maintenance, a reduction of $4.6 billion from the request. This provides zero real growth over the fiscal year 1986 level.

Approval of a lower level of O&M funding in fiscal year 1987 than in fiscal year 1986 for the Navy, Air Force, Army Reserve, and Air National Guard accounts.

MANPOWER

Reduction of 6,850 active duty personnel from the requested total end strength of 2,181,100.

Approval of a 4% increase in basic pay and basic allowance for subsistence and an average increase of 4% in basic allowance for quarters for all uniformed service personnel effective October 1, 1986, including a 4% increase in pay for cadets and midshipmen.

Denial of the requested growth of 60,524 in the average strength of the Selected Reserve, thereby authorizing an average strength of the Selected Reserve of 1,103,576.

Denial of the requested growth of 12,112 in the end strength of reserve personnel serving on active duty, or full time National Guard Duty, thereby authorizing an end strength for such personnel of 64,277.

Authorization of a civilian personnel end strength 1,084,836, a reduction of 29,780 from the estimated end strength in the fiscal year 1987 budget request.

SUMMARY OF NOTIFICATIONS, REPORTS OR STUDIES REQUESTED

1. A report by the Secretary of Defense on ICBM Modernization to be submitted in conjunction with the annual report to Congress on the ICBM Modernization Program.
2. A report to the Congress by the Nuclear Weapons Council on the further implementation of the President's Blue Ribbon Task Group on Nuclear Weapons Program Management by March 1, 1987.
3. A report from the Secretary of Energy by December 1, 1986 on the comparative costs in building containment facilities for DOE reactors versus construction of a new production reactor.
4. A report from the Secretary of Defense on establishing a federally funded research and development center (FFRDC) for the SDI.
5. A report from the Director of Defense Research and Engineering on apportioning funds for the conventional defense initiative.
6. A report by the Secretary of Defense prior to full scale engineering development of an Anti-Tactical Ballistic Missile (ATBM) system estimating the costs and schedule associated with the program.
7. A certification by the Secretary of the Navy that certain conditions have been met before obligating or expending funds for the MSH-X program.

8. A certification by the Secretary of the Army that the Aquila system has satisfactorily demonstrated that it meets or exceeds all performance criteria established by the Army.

9. A report by the Secretary of Defense on the selection of either the Advanced Field Artillery Tactical Data System (AFATDS) or Marine Integrated Fire and Air Support System (MIFASS) by December 15, 1986.

10. A certification by the Secretary of Defense that the designs of the Advanced Tactical Fighter (ATF) and Advanced Tactical Aircraft (ATA) will accommodate the essential requirements necessary for cross-service utilization by the Navy and the Air Force.

11. A study by the Secretary of the Army on the Army's major system acquisition plans, due by March 1, 1987.

12. A certification by the Secretary of the Army that multiyear procurement of the Stinger Weapon System is less costly than a competitive approach, to be be validated by the General Accounting Office (GAO).

13. A notification from the Secretary of the Army when renegotiations are complete on Option III of the Single Channel Ground and Airborne Radio System (SINCGARS).

14. A report by the Marine Corps Operational Test and Evaluation Activity (MCOTEA) on the evaluation of the Unit Level Circuit Switch (ULCS).

15. A report by the Chief of each Guard and Reserve component on the items to be procured with the additional ($465.0 million) authorization of this act, within 120 days after the date of enactment.

16. A certification by the Secretary of Defense that the multiyear savings of the HARM Weapon System will be 10% or greater prior to executing the multiyear contract.

17. A report by October 1, 1986 from the Department of the Army on the most cost-effective plan for the destruction of the unitary chemical weapons stockpile.

AUTHORIZATION MODIFICATIONS DUE TO SUBSEQUENT BUDGETARY ACTIONS

The committee ordered reported the bill which this report accompanies on June 26, 1986. At that time, the Congress had not agreed to the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for fiscal year 1987. The defense spending levels subsequently agreed to in the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for fiscal year 1987 are substantially different from those authorized in the bill which this report accompanies. The committee may act to alter the funding levels discussed herein. If such action is taken, charts and other portions of this report may be superseded by subsequent or supplemental reports, or documents to be included in the Congressional Record.

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

BACKGROUND ON PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION

In 1959, section 138, title 10, United States Code, was amended by enactment of section 412(b) of Public Law 86-149, which required annual congressional authorization of appropriations for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels. Over the years, the law has been amended to require annual authorization of additional items such as tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes and related support equipment, various other weapons, support equipment, and other procurement items.

The committee and its various subcommittees held extensive hearings on the Department of defense fiscal year 1987 request and related matters. Based on supporting testimony and other information provided to the committee, an exhaustive review of the many procurement programs and related requirements has been made. The committee's recommendations appear in the following pages.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED FUNDING CHANGES

The table below gives a comparison of the amounts provided for procurement for fiscal year 1986 with amounts requested for authorization in the President's budget for fiscal year 1987 and those

FISCAL YEAR 1987 PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION REQUEST

(Dollars amounts in thousands; totals may not add due to rounding)

	FY 86 FINAL	FY 87 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
Army	18,842,788	18,578,500	-1,234,900	17,343,600
Navy/Marine Corps	35,274,221	36,549,700	-2,578,483	33,971,217
Air Force	39,915,649	39,010,100	-2,538,948	36,471,152
Defense Agencies	1,287,740	1,488,400	-10,900	1,477,500
National Guard and Reserve	1,501,800	0	465,000	465,000
DOD NATO Cooperative Programs	15,000	0	0	0
Coastal Defense Augmentation	235,000	0	0	0
Chemical Demilitarization Program	0	120,100	0	120,100
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT	97,072,198	95,746,800	-5,898,231	89,848,569

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	FIXED WING										
1	C-12 CARGO AIRPLANE	6	12,000						0		
2	GUARDRAIL/COMMON SENSOR ROLL								0		3,300
3	RC-12D RECON AIRPLANE								0	6	72,100
	ROTARY										
4	CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER (CHINOOK)								0		
5	EH-60A HELICOPTER (QUICKFIX) (MYP)	18	104,600	18	135,000		-20,000	18	115,000		[ ]
6	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		24,400		16,900				16,900		
7	AH-64 ATTACK HELICOPTER (APACHE)	144	1,087,800	144	1,189,300	-24	-125,000	120	1,064,300		[ ]
8	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		55,300		39,100				39,100		
9	UH-60A (BLACK HAWK) (MYP)	78	210,900	78	155,400			78	155,400	85	336,600
10	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		199,000		195,000		-10,000		185,000		191,400
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS								0		891,100
	SUBTOTAL, AIRCRAFT		1,694,000		1,730,700		-155,000		1,575,700		1,494,500
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT										
11	OV-1 SURVEILLANCE AIRPLANE (MOHAWK)		22,700		24.900				24,900		39,300
12	RC-12D RECON AIRPLANE								0		
13	RV-1 RECON AIRPLANE				2,700				2,700		5,400
14	AH1S ATTACK HELICOPTER (COBRA-TOW)		128,900		61,000		-27,000		34,000		81,000
15	AH-64 MODS				33,400				33,400		33,000
16	CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER (MYP)		219,000		208,400				208,400		173,900
17	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		124,800		58,600				58,600		69,200
18	CH-54 CARGO HELICOPTER (TARHE)		500		1,300				1,300		10,300
19	EH-1 ELECTRONIC HELICOPTER (Q-FIX MOD)								0		
20	OH-58 OBSERVATION HELICOPTER (KIOWA)								0		

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
21	UH-1 UTILITY HELICOPTER (IROQUOIS)		11,700		6,300				6,300		18,800
22	UH-60A (BLACK HAWK) MODS		13,600		7,700				7,700		18,800
23	ARMY HELICOPTER IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (AHIP)		166,600		164,900		-29,000		135,900		113,200
24	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		20,900		45,400				45,400		129,100
25	AIR TO AIR STINGER ACFT MOD				28,800				28,800		41,500
26	AIRBORNE AVIONICS		1,000		100				100		1,900
27	ASE MODIFICATIONS CLOSE COMBAT				3,500				3,500		100
28	MODIFICATIONS UNDER $2.0M (AIRCRAFT)		100		100				100		2,600
29	ACFT 9MM		16,300		12,000				12,000		24,400
30	SOF AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS				3,500				3,500		67,900
	SUBTOTAL, MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT		726,100		662,600		-56,000		606,600		829,500
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS										
31	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		814,300		710,500		0		710,500		786,900
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES										
	GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS										
32	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT				11,600		0		11,600		88,500
	OTHER SUPPORT										
33	AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		65,000		57,900		-7,900		50,000		80,400
34	HELIBORNE C2 CONSOLE								0		2,300
35	MLS AVIONICS								0		7,600
36	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		33,500		28,400				28,400		29,700
37	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL		9,000		4,800				4,800		2,900
38	SYNTHETIC FLIGHT TRAINING SYSTEMS	7	117,100	3	37,700			3	37,700	3	61,500
39	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		59,300		16,000				16,000		22,800
40	WAR CONSUMABLES		5,900		4,500				4,500		4,200
	SUBTOTAL, SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES		289,800		160,900		-7,900		153,000		299,900
	UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION		---		---		-13,000		-13,000		---
	PRIOR YEAR PROGRAM SAVINGS (FY 86)		---		---		-47,200		-47,200		---
	TOTAL, ARMY AIRCRAFT		3,524,200		3,264,700		-279,100		2,985,600		3,410,800

15

ACQUISITION PLANS FOR MAJOR ARMY SYSTEMS

The committee believes the Army should undertake a systematic review of its acquisition plans for major combat systems. Three factors have led the committee to this conclusion.

First, many of the Army's front line systems are nearing the end of their approved production run, yet the Army is far short of fully modernizing its forces. For example, the Army intends to conclude procurement of the AH-64 Apache helicopter at 675 aircraft, even though only 40 percent of the attack fleet will be modernized with AH-64's. A similar situation exists for other primary combat systems, including M-1 tanks, Bradley vehicles, UH-60 utility helicopters, Multiple Launch Rocket Systems, and other smaller systems.

Second, the Army has not developed comprehensive acquisition plans for follow-on systems. In some cases, such as the LHX helicopter, the program is of questionable affordability in light of budget constraints. In other cases, such as the M-1 tank, there is no immediate plan, only long run objectives for modular fighting vehicles that would not be fielded until the turn of the century. Generally, current Army combat systems conclude approved production programs in the next five years, while follow-on systems will not enter production until the mid-to-late 1990s.

Third, budget constraints will limit major development efforts in the next five years. In the near term, the most cost-effective way to expand the capabilities of Army systems is to make block improvements to existing systems. For example, the Army is now concluding a very successful introduction of the A1 model of the M-1 Abrams tank which represents a significant increase in capability. While the committee does not intend to preclude development of future combat systems, it appears the Army is devoting too little attention to block improvements of existing systems.

For these reasons the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the Army's major acquisition plans. That evaluation should include the following: (a) requirements for retaining an active production base for combat systems, (b) a reevaluation of the inventory objective for existing systems, (c) feasible improvements in existing systems that will improve their combat capabilities, (d) block improvements that will help lower future operating and support costs as well as improve capabilities, and (e) a transition plan that ties together the current system, block improvements to current systems, and postulated future systems which are still in early R&D phases but which represent long-term Army plans for future combat. This acquisition masterplan should be available to the Congress by March 1, 1987.

EH-60 QUICK FIX II

The administration requested $135.0 million for the procurement of 18 EH-60A aircraft and $16.9 million in advance procurement for fiscal year 1988.

The EH-60 Quick Fix II is an ECM/ESM (Electronic Countermeasures/Electromagnetic Support Measures) system intended to provide tactical signal intelligence and electronic warfare support to Army units. The EH-60A Quick Fix II will replace the EH-1X and EH-1H Quick Fix systems based in Europe. Quick Fix II will provide division level forces with their primary source of airborne electronic countermeasures, intercept, and radio direction finding.

The committee recommends an authorization of $115.0 million for the procurement of 18 EH-60A aircraft in 1987 and $16.9 million in advanced procurement for fiscal year 1988.

AH-64 (APACHE) ATTACK HELICOPTER

The administration requested $1,189.3 million for the procurement of 144 AH-64 Apache helicopters in fiscal year 1987 and $39.1 million in advance procurement for fiscal year 1988.

The AH-64 is a highly mobile attack helicopter intended to be the Army's primary, quick reacting, airborne anti-tank weapon. Armed with Hellfire missiles. 2.75 inch rockets, a 30mm cannon and a highly sophisticated mission equipment package, the Apache is capable of operating at night and in adverse weather with unprecedented effectiveness and survivability.

The committee recommends authorization of $1,064.3 for the procurement of 120 AH-64 Apache helicopters in fiscal year 1987 and $39.1 million for advance procurement in fiscal year 1988. This reduction of 24 aircraft and $125.0 million is based strictly on budgetary constraints and is made without prejudice.

UH-60 BLACKHAWK HELICOPTER

The administration requested $155.4 million for the procurement of 78 UH-60 helicopters in fiscal year 1987 and $195.0 million in advance procurement for 85 helicopters in fiscal year 1988. The fiscal year 1987 request includes a proposal to initiate a third multiyear contract for the UH-60/EH-60 airframe.

The UH-60 Blackhawk helicopter is the Army's squad-carrying helicopter designed to lift an infantry squad of 11 combat-equipped soldiers in tactical assaults and related combat support missions.

The committee recommends authorization of $155.4 million in procurement and $185.0 million in advance procurement for the UH-60 Blackhawk. This reduction of $10.0 million in advance procurement is based strictly on budgetary constraints and is made without prejudice. The committee also recommends approval of the administration's request for multiyear procurement of UH-60A Blackhawk and EH-60 Quickfix helicopters.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	OTHER MISSILES										
	SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM										
1	CHAPARRAL		54,900	456	103,700		-3,000	456	100,700	960	114,500
2	NON LINE OF SIGHT AIR DEFENSE SYSTEM								0		14,200
3	AIR DEFENSE DIVISION SYSTEM HEAVY				9,100		-9,100		0		65,400
4	AIR DEFENSE DIVISION SYSTEM LIGHT								0		[ ]
5	OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT		5,000		6,500				6,500		4,700
6	PATRIOT (MYP)	585	928,100	700	951,500		-31,500	700	920,000	715	912,700
7	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)				45,300				45,300		40,100
8	STINGER (MYP)	3,439	246,600	4,180	251,700			4,180	251,700	5,964	337,700
9	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)				40,300				40,300		45,500
	AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM										
10	LASER HELLFIRE SYSTEM	5,750	223,200						0	4,800	190,600
	ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYSTEM										
11	TOW 2	12,700	160,900	12,000	134,600		-8,600	12,000	126,000	12,000	176,300
12	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		22,000		15,500				15,500		
13	PERSHING	[ ]	224,500		31,800				31,800		[ ]
14	MULTIPLE LAUNCH ROCKET SYSTEM (MYP)	72,000	468,900	72,000	474,200		-5,000	72,000	469,200	72,000	480,200
15	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		41,000						0		
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS								0		81,700
	SUBTOTAL, OTHER MISSILES		2,375,100		2,064,200		-57,200		2,007,000		2,463,600

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES										
16	PATRIOT		16,500		38,600				38,600		52,800
17	CHAPARRAL		106,732		5,200				5,200		13,500
18	HAWK		46,900		68,200				68,200		50,500
19	TOW		16,900		53,000				53,000		38,900
20	DRAGON				4,700		-4,700		0		
21	LANCE MODIFICATIONS				3,800				3,800		16,100
22	LCSS								0		
23	PERSHING MODIFICATIONS								0		10,100
24	AN/TSQ-73								0		
	SUBTOTAL, MODIFICATION OF MISSILES		187,032		173,500		-4,700		168,800		181,900
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS										
25	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		286,800		150,900		-5,000		145,900		301,300
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES										
26	AIR DEFENSE TARGETS		19,800		32,400				32,400		31,600
27	ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (MISSILES)		3,700		1,500				1,500		2,200
28	PRODUCTION BASE SPT		29,900		15,700				15,700		17,700
29	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		2,000						0		
	SUBTOTAL, SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES		55,400		49,600		0		49,600		51,500
	UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION		---		---		-16,400		-16,400		---
	TOTAL, ARMY MISSILES		2,904,332		2,438,200		-83,300		2,354,900		2,998,300

STINGER

The administration requested authority to enter a multiyear contract for the procurement of Stinger air defense missiles. The committee supports the use of multiyear contracts when appropriate, but recognizes that in many instances competitive procurement strategies may yield even greater savings. This is particularly true for systems which are not unduly complex, have relatively low unit costs, and which will be brought in large quantities. Most tactical missiles appear to meet these criteria. Historically, competitive missile procurement programs have consistently yielded greater savings and higher system reliability rates than even the most optimistic projections.

While the Air Force and Navy have vigorously pursued competition in tactical missile programs (e.g., Sidewinder, Sparrow, Maverick, Phoenix, and AMRAAM) the Army has been less aggressive. Currently the only Army missile procured competitively is the Hellfire, with consideration being given to competing Chapparal.

The Stinger appears to be an ideal candidate for competition. With a procurement objective greater than 67,000 missiles (of which only 11,650 have been procured) and a production run that will continue well into the 1990's, the committee believes the potential benefits from establishing a second source may exceed the 10.4 percent savings projected for the Stinger multiyear contract.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to solicit bids to establish a competitive second source for the Stinger missile. Such bids shall contain binding ("not to exceed") production cost estimates to enable the Secretary to determine which contracting method (competitive or multiyear) is the more cost-effective.

Approval to enter a multiyear contract for the Stinger missile shall be contingent upon the submission of a report from the Secretary of the Army to the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services in which the Secretary certifies that the multiyear approach is, overall, less costly than a competitive approach. The committee will request that such a certification be validated by the General Accounting Office (GAO).

Should the Secretary determine that a competitive strategy would yield greater savings than a multiyear contract, the Army is encouraged to expedite (through a reprogramming action if necessary) the qualification of the second source.

TOW II

The administration requested $134.6 million for the procurement of 12,000 TOW II anti-tank missiles in fiscal year 1987 and $15.5 million for advance procurement in fiscal year 1988.

In the report (S.R. 99-41) accompanying the Fiscal Year 1986 Defense Authorization bill the committee included language urging the Army to establish a competitive second source for the TOW missile and stating that if the Army chose not to pursue a second source, the committee would require a compelling justification to support that decision. To date, the Army has not proposed a TOW second source, nor have they provided justification for not doing so.

The committee notes that while the TOW II will eventually be replaced by the Advanced Anti-Armor Weapon System-Heavy (AAWS-H), that replacement is at least seven years, and perhaps longer, from being fielded. No funds were requested in fiscal year 1987 for research and development of AAWS-H. In the meantime, the Army plans to continue the procurement of TOW II at a rate of 12,000 missiles per year throughout the Five Year Defense Plan (FYDP) and beyond.

The committee believes that cost savings and reliability improvements could be achieved by establishing a competitive second source for the TOW II. The Army is therefore directed to establish expeditiously a second source for TOW II. Funds made available for the procurement of missiles in fiscal year 1987 may be used to select and qualify the second source.

The committee recommends authorization of $126.0 million for the procurement of 12,000 missiles in fiscal year 1987, and $15.5 million for advance procurement in fiscal year 1988.

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL QTY	FY 86 FINAL AMOUNT	FY 87 REQUEST QTY	FY 87 REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION RECOMMENDATION QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT	FY 88 PROJECTION QTY	FY 88 PROJECTION AMOUNT
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES										
1	CARRIER, COMMAND POST LIGHT, FT, M577A2	144	30,600	300	64,100			300	64,100		
2	CARRIER, PERSONNEL, FT, ARM, M113A3	451	117,700						0	300	80,800
3	BRADLEY FIGHTING VEHICLES (MYP)	716	905,900	870	1,121,800	150	-195,000	720	926,800	870	1,163,600
4	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		27,600		20,600				20,600		13,200
5	BRADLEY FVS TRAINING DEVICES		73,200		9,500				9,500		
6	BRADLFY FVS TRAINING DEVICES (MOD)								0		6,200
7	FIELD ARTILLERY AMMUNITION SUPPORT VEH	135	64,800	141	67,500		-4,000	141	63,500	162	77,400
8	HOWITZER, MED SP, FT, 155MM, M109A2								0		
9	RECOVERY VEHICLE, MED, FT, M88A1	233	199,400		42,800		34,000		8,800	100	121,100
10	ABRAMS TANK SERIES ROLL (MYP)	840	1,505,000	840	1,643,600			840	1,643,600	840	1,738,800
11	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		348,200		351,400				351,400		356,000
12	M60 SERIES TANK TRAINING DEVICES		16,800		33,500				33,500		32,400
13	M1 SERIES TANK TRAINING DEVICES		61,000		9,500				9,500		900
	MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES										
14	CARRIER, MOD		54,700		48,400		-6,500		41,900		61,500
15	IMPROVED TOW VEHICLE (ITV) (MOD)								0		
16	FIST VEHICLE (MOD)		71,900		53,800				53,800		18,200
17	BFVS SERIES (MOD)		12,000		35,100				35,100		56,700
18	HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109 SER (MOD)		6,000		20,800				20,800		64,500
19	ARMORED VEH LAUNCH BRIDGE (AVLB) (MOD)		15,600						0		
20	TANK, COMBAT, FT, 105MM GUN, M60SER (MOD)(MYP)		105,200		48,300				48,300		77,600
21	TANK, M1 SERIES (MOD)		53,900		80,400				80,400		175,700
22	9WW								0		2,800
23	MOB TNG BASE EQUIP				17,000		-10,000		7,000		17,600
24	HOST NATION SUPPORT				4,700				4,700		

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES										
25	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		600,600		469,800				469,800		542,100
26	VALUE ENGINEERING								0		
27	ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (TCV-WTCV)		800		2,000				2,000		2,000
28	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV)		78,900		57,800				57,800		41,800
	SUBTOTAL, TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES		4,349,800		4,202,400		-249,500		3,952,900		4,650,900
	WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES										
29	FOLLOW-ON AIR DEFENSE GUN		150,000						0		
30	HOWITZER, LIGT,TOWED, 105MM, L119			64	26,500			64	26,500	120	32,000
31	HOWITZER, MED, TOWED, 155MM, M198								0	18	11,900
32	MACHINE GUN, 7.62MM, M60			1,647	5,000			1,647	5,000	1,814	5,400
33	ARMOR MACHINE GUN, 7.62MM M240			4,509	24,200			4,509	24,200	4,495	25,000
34	MOUNT MACH GUN CAL 50 M3								0	3,604	2,200
35	SQUAD AUTOMATIC WEAPON (SAW) 5.56MM			4,800	12,900			4,800	12,900	6,000	16,500
36	GRENADE LAUNCHER, AUTO, 40MM, MK19-3						15,000		15,000		
37	LAUNCHER, SMOKE GRENADE	3,177	2,100	4,217	1,800			4,217	1,800	3,270	2,000
38	MORTAR, 81MM, M252	168	5,700	457	10,100			457	10,100	453	10,500
39	MORTAR 120 MM	63	5,000	145	13,200			145	13,200	267	22,400
40	M16 RIFLE	71,990	35,000	76,235	36,800			76,235	36,800	85,460	38,800
41	PERSONAL DEFENSE WEAPON, 9MM	25,400	7,500	21,219	4,400			21,219	4,400	23,418	5,100
42	VEH RAPID FIRE WPN SYS-BUSHMASTER (MYP)	715	31,900	947	37,300			947	37,300	947	38,000
43	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		8,300		3,200				3,200		2,200
44	TANK MUZZLE BORESIGHT DEVICE	2,327	4,000						0		
	MODIFICATION OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBA										
45	M16A1 RIFLE MODS		3,300		3,300				3,300		3,500
46	MODIFICATIONS UNDER $2.0M (WOCV-WTCV)		2,500		4,000				4,000		4,800
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES										
47	REP SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS (WOCV-WTCV)		28,600		17,600				17,600		28,000
48	ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (WOCV-WTCV)		2,900		3,300				3,300		3,400
49	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV)		40,200		37,000				37,000		43,500
50	CANNON TUBE FORGINGS FOR SURGE				9,600		-3,600		6,000		
	SUBTOTAL, WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES		327,000		250,200		11,400		261,600		295,200

23

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION		---		---		-74,700		-74,700		---
	PRIOR YEAR PROGRAM SAVINGS (FY 86)		---		---		-38,800		-38,800		---
	TOTAL, ARMY WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES		4,676,800		4,452,600		-351,600		4,101,000		4,946,100

BRADLEY FIGHTING VEHICLE

The administration requested $1,121.8 million for the procurement of 870 Bradley Fighting Vehicles in fiscal year 1987 and $20.6 million in advance procurement for 870 vehicles in 1988.

The Bradley Fighting Vehicles include the Infantry Fighting Vehicle (IFV) and the Cavalry Fighting Vehicle (CFV). The IFV/CFV will provide mechanized infantry and scouts of armored cavalry the necessary mobility, fire power, and survivability to operate on the modern battlefield and to accomplish reconnaissance and security missions. The mission of the IFV is to provide cross-country mobility and vehicular mounted fire power to support mechanized infantry operations in mounted and dismounted combat.

During the past year the Bradley has been criticized as unsafe for use in combat, and the Army has been criticized for failing to test adequately the vulnerabilities of the vehicle. The committee believes these charges are misplaced and that viewed in proper context, the Bradley is survivable and makes an essential contribution to our maneuver forces.

In response to the Bradley's critics, the committee notes that no battlefield system (not even a tank) is invulnerable. Battlefield survivability is not solely a function of armor, munitions storage and spall liners, but also is heavily influenced by speed, agility, firepower and tactics. In each of these areas the Bradley is far superior to its predecessor, the M-113. Furthermore, survivability is not the sole design criterion for a combat vehicle. The most survivable vehicle in one scenario may lack the features required to perform a broad range of missions. For example, placing the ammunition outside the vehicle may make the vehicle more survivable, but it may also increase the vulnerability of the ammunition (and the soldier who must retrieve it) and thereby reduce the vehicle's overall combat effectiveness.

Next, the survivability tests conducted to date are artificial—fully loaded stationary vehicles are struck by weapons against which the vehicles were not designed to survive. Despite the limited value of such testing, the tests have demonstrated that the Bradley is considerably more survivable than its predecessor—ignoring entirely the Bradley's ability to move quickly on the battlefield and to engage attacking forces well beyond the range of main battle tank guns.

The Army has been criticized for the "unrealistic" nature of the Bradley vulnerability tests. The committee notes that all such testing—short of actual combat—is inherently artificial and therefore "unrealistic". However, repeated independent investigations have concluded that there is no evidence of Army manipulation of the test program. The Army has conducted and continues to conduct a comprehensive test in a cost-effective manner. Critics of the Bradley have called for a large number of "random" shots fired into fully loaded vehicles, using weapons the vehicle was not designed to withstand. This method ("random aim point") may be preferred when a large number of test vehicles are available since it prevents any bias (whether intentional or not) from influencing aim point selection. However, when only a limited number of vehicles are available for live fire testing, this aim point selection technique may be the least desirable since any shot selected at random may destroy the entire vehicle. In the case of the Bradley, only two vehicles (at a price of $1.3 million each) have been dedicated to the test program and the Army has chosen instead to use the "selected aim point" method to maximize the useful data from each test shot. The committee finds no fault with the Army's decision.

The committee supports the continued testing of the Bradley and other combat systems to assess vulnerability and to evaluate modifications to increase battlefield survivability. In the case of the Bradley, such modifications should be considered part of an evolutionary approach to improving what is already an excellent fighting vehicle.

The committee recommends an authorization of $926.8 million for the procurement of 720 Bradleys in fiscal year 1987. This reduction of 150 vehicles and $195.0 million is based strictly on budgetary constraints and is made without prejudice.

M-1 ABRAMS MAIN BATTLE TANK

The administration requested $1,643.6 million for the procurement of 840 M-1 Abrams Main Battle Tanks in 1987, and $351.4 million for the procurement of 840 tanks in 1988.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request.

9MM HANDGUN

The administration requested $4.4 million for the personal defense weapon (9mm handgun) in fiscal year 1987. The committee directs that no undistributed reduction be applied to this program.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	AMMUNITION										
	ATOMIC MATERIEL										
1	NUCLEAR WEAPONS SUPPORT MATERIEL		3,400		2,600				2,600		2,400
2	PROJECTILE, NUCLEAR				11,700				11,700		[ ]
	CONTROLLED ITEMS										
3	CTG, 5.56MM, BALL M193	66,420	10,100	109,784	15,000			109,784	15,000	65,910	10,900
4	CTG, 5.56MM, TRACER			20,982	5,600			20,982	5,600	21,056	6,800
5	CTG, 5.56MM, TRACER CLIP			15,625	4,800			15,625	4,800	2,421	900
6	CTG, 5.56MM, BLANK M200	77,496	10,000	56,965	7,000	136,268	12,500	193,233	19,500	165,925	22,300
7	CTG, 5.56MM, BLK M200, LKD F/SAW	8,998	2,200	90,476	18,400	-30,496	-6,200	59,980	12,200	26,421	6,500
8	CTG, 5.56MM, 4 BALL M855/1 TRCR M856 LKD	27,164	3,600	99,098	29,400			99,098	29,400	101,354	36,300
9	CTG, 5.56MM BALL M16-A2	125,679	25,000	18,845	3,400			18,845	3,400	119,553	26,500
10	CTG, 5.56MM TRACER M16-A2	21,954	6,500						0	25,462	8,900
11	CTG, 7.62MM, 4 BALL M80/1 TRCR M62 LKD	93,576	25,800	275,589	68,500	-140,800	-35,200	134,789	33,300	262,087	81,300
12	CTG, 7.62MM, BALL M80 LKD/M13	2,484	700	10,562	2,700			10,562	2,700	14,722	4,700
13	CTG, 7.62MM, LKD 4 BALL ITRACER OHF	6,049	2,000	1,667	500			1,667	500	7,510	2,800
14	CTG, 7.62MM, BLANK M82 LKD/M13			72,064	15,900	17,075	3,400	89,139	19,300	41,221	11,200
15	CTG, CAL .45, BALL M1911	16,902	2,200	5,936	700			5,936	700	8,396	1,200
16	CTG, CAL .50, PLASTIC LKD 4 BALL/1 TRACER			4,665	5,400			4,665	5,400	3,000	2,800
17	CTG, CAL .50, LKD 4 BALL/1 TRCR W/M15A2L	7,727	11,300	7,395	9,600			7,395	9,600	8,250	12,000
18	CTG, CAL .50, APIT, M20 LKD	961	1,400	3,026	4,000			3,026	4,000	3,275	5,300
19	CTG, CAL .50, BALL LKD	3,830	3,800	2,778	2,500			2,778	2,500	4,257	4,700
20	CTG, CAL .50, BLK, M1A1, LKD W/M9LK F/M2 MG								0	14,689	12,600
21	CTG, CAL .50, BLANK M1A1, LKD F/M85MG(MYP)								0	3,006	2,900
22	CTG, CAL .50, LKD TRACER M17								0		
23	CTG, CAL .50, LKD 4 BALL/1 TRACER W/M9 L	45,325	48,000	23,752	22,900			23,752	22,900	30,001	34,800
24	CTG, 20MM, LKD TP-T M220 SERIES MLB M14A	2,238	7,900	3,028	9,700	2,648	1,600	5,676	11,300	2,056	7,900
25	CTG, 20MM, LKD 4 TP M55A2/1TP-T M220			1,202	3,300	733	2,000	1,935	5,300	1,509	5,000
26	CTG, 25MM, HEI-T M792 W/F	1,081	24,900	2,813	48,700	-1,415	-24.500	1,398	24,200	2,532	57,600

		FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
LINE NO.	PROGRAM	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
27	CTG, 25MM, APDS-T M791 W/M28(MYP)	489	11,100						0		
28	CTG, 25MM, TPT LKD M793 MLB M28	2,724	41,200	2,018	25,500	-46	-600	1,972	24,900	1,263	18,500
29	CTG, 30MM, LKD HEDP M789 W/FUZE	142	5,000						0		
30	CTG, 30MM, LKD TP M788	913	9,300	260	2,400			260	2,400	188	2,100
31	CTG, 40MM, HEDP M430	3,674	43,500	2,673	28,700	-857	-9,200	1,816	19,500	3,772	49,000
32	CTG 40MM TP F/MK19	344	4,800	541	7,500			541	7,500	593	8,000
33	CTG, 40MM, GREEN STAR PARACHUTE								0	225	3,900
34	CTG, 40MM, PRAC M781	2,744	4,600	2,363	3,600	4,307	6,600	6,670	10,200	4,136	7,600
35	CTG, 40MM, RED SMOKE MARKER			133	1,800			133	1,800	237	3,900
36	CTG, 40MM, GREEN SMOKE MARKER			141	1,900			141	1,900	239	3,900
37	CTG, 40MM, YELLOW SMOKE MARKER			139	1,900			139	1,900	248	4,100
38	CTG, 40MM WHITE STAR CLUSTER M585 F/LCHR M79								0	109	2,700
39	CTG, 40MM, RED STAR, PARACHUTE								0	214	3,800
40	CTG, 75MM, BLANK, M337A1 F/HOWITZER	151	2,800						0		
41	CTG, 81MM: ILLUM XM853	25	7,500	12	3,400			12	3,400	12	2,900
42	CTG, 81MM: HE, M821 W/FUZE M734 MO	255	47,700	404	91,300			404	91,300	97	23,500
43	CTG, 81MM: SMOKE, RP, XM819	18	6,200	45	11,000			45	11,000	53	11,800
44	CTG, 81MM: FULL RANGE, PRACTICE, XM879								0		
45	CTG, 81MM: 1/10 RNG, PRAC, XM880	27	2,400	41	2,900			41	2,900	27	2,400
46	CTG, 4.2-IN HE M329A2 W/O FUZE	339	32,400	247	22,000			247	22,000		
47	CTG, 120MM: HE, XM933, W/FUZE M734 MO			126	44,700	-60	-21,200	66	23,500	141	42,600
48	CTG, 120MM: ILLUM, XM930			11	5,500	-4	-1,900	7	3,600	14	5,600
49	CTG, 120MM: SMOKE, XM929			29	14,300	-13	-6,900	16	7,400	34	14,200
50	CTG, 105MM, HEAT MP T M456A2	118	41,600	19	7,700	-19	-7,700	0	0		
51	CTG, 105MM, TP-T, M490	241	32,100			241	32,000	241	32,000	120	17,300
52	CTG, 105MM, TRACE-P FOR M833		2,300						0		
53	TG, 105MM, DS-TP M724	531	89,400	274	41,600			274	41,600	230	42,200
54	CTG, 105MM, APFSDS-T M833	77	42,300	41	20,300			41	20,300	61	36,900
55	CTG, 120MM APFSDS-T M829	88	132,000	62	75,900			62	75,900	71	89,600
56	CTG, 120MM HEAT-MP-T, M830(MYP)	20	42,100	15	27,800			15	27,800	8	17,900
57	CTG, 120MM TP-T M831 (MYP)	33	39,600		[ ]				[ ]		[ ]
58	CTG, 120MM TPCSDS-T, M865(MYP)	85	65,000	174	104,900	-21	-12,400	153	92,500	201	123,200
59	PROJ, 155MM, HE, ICM M483	609	269,800	441	173,000			441	173,000	183	91,300
60	PROJ, 155M, SMK, WP, M825	35	13,100	52	13,500	36	9,400	88	22,900	26	10,900

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
61	PROJ, 155MM, HE, ADAM M692								0		
62	PROJ, 155MM, HE, ADAM M731	5	20,600	9	33,900	2	5,700	11	39,600	6	28,000
63	PROJ, 155MM, HE, RAAMS M718			9	11,900		-3,100	9	8,800	5	8,900
64	PROJ, 155MM, HE, RAAMS M741	46	75,100	74	105,400	-47	-64,500	27	40,900	21	37,100
65	PROJ, 155MM, BASEBLEED, XM864.			35	31,600			35	31,600	102	71,700
66	PROJ, 155M, HE, COPPERHEAD (EA)	5,874	219,100	220	8,200	85	10,000	305	18,200	5,832	190,100
67	PROJ, 155MM, CHEM GB-2	18	21,700		[ ]				[ ]		[ ]
68	CHARGE, PROPELLING, M155MM, GREEN BAG M3	252	12,200	866	38,000	-266	-11,700	600	26,300	115	6,100
69	CHARGE, PROPELLING, M155MM, WHITE BAG M4								0		
70	CHARGE, PROPELLING, M155MM, RED BAG M203	61	20,400	77	20,000			77	20,000	116	37,600
71	CHARGE, PROPELLING, M155MM, RED BAG M119			637	55,600			637	55,600	470	46,900
72	PROJ, 8-INCH, HE, ICM (DP), M509	54	50,000			90	86,700		86,700		
73	PROJ, 8-INCH, HE, RAP, M650	23	26,000	36	37,300	-13	-13,500	23	23,800	27	33,400
74	CHARGE, PROPELLING, 8-INCH WB, M188			22	4,000	-22	-4,000	0	0		
75	FUZE, PROXIMITY, M732								0	190	16,700
76	FUZE, PD M739/M739A1					480	9,700		9,700		
77	FUZE, MTSC M577/M577A1	798	49,300	207	11,700	60	3,400	267	15,100	348	21.400
78	FUZE, MTSQ M582/M582A1	164	10,500	191	11,200			191	11,200	25	1,600
79	PRIMER, PERC, M82	1,418	2,900	970	1,800	674	1,200	1,644	3,000	624	1,400
80	GROUND IMP MINE SCAT SYS AP M74(MYP)						8,600		8,600		
81	GROUND IMP MINE SCAT SYS AT .175(MYP)						20,600		20,600		
82	CANISTER MINE PRACTICE XM88 (VOLCANO)			8	1,900			8	1,900	12	3,000
83	CANISTER MINE (VOLCANO) XM87			16	31,600			16	31,600	17	31,200
84	MTR RKT 5 IN MK22 MOD4	3,143	11,400	4,048	13,300	-1,278	4,200	2,770	9,100	2,332	9,300
85	LINE CHARGE M58A3 (MICLIC)	1,894	22,300	2,307	24,400	-104	-1,100	2,203	23,300	1,293	17,900
86	MODUALR PACK MINE SYSTEM			1,940	23,400			1,940	23,400	3,480	36,200
87	PURSUIT DETERRENT MUNITION			11	2,100			11	2,100		
88	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS & OTHER		16,500		13,700				13,700		17,100
89	DEMO KIT BANGALORE TORPEDO	7	3,000						0		
90	RETROFIT, CTG 105MM HE M760								0		
91	LIGHTWEIGHT MULTI-PURPOSE WEAPON	81	58,200	136	82,500			136	82,500	136	84,900
92	LIGHT WGT MULTI PURPOSE SYSTEM TRNR	1,645	3,100	963	2,500	447	4,800	1,410	7,300	961	2,400
93	HYDRA 70 RKT, MPSM HE M261 WHD(MYP)	33	28,900						0		
94	HYDRA 70 RKT HE/RS (M151/M433)					15	7,700	15	7,700	23	12,900

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL QTY	FY 86 FINAL AMOUNT	FY 87 REQUEST QTY	FY 87 REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION RECOMMENDATION QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT	FY 88 PROJECTION QTY	FY 88 PROJECTION AMOUNT
---	HYDRA 70 SMK					28	13,700	28	13,700		---
95	HYDRA 70 RKT ILLUM M257 WHD					27	19,600	27	19,600	8	6,200
96	HYDRA 70 RKT, MPSM PRAC M267 WHD	8	5,400	4	2,700	42	18,900	46	21,600	23	16,600
97	HYDRA 70 RKT, HE/PD (M151/M423/MK66)	23	7,000	185	44,800			185	44,800		
98	GRENADE, HAND, ALL TYPES		28,700		27,400				27,400		24,000
99	GREN SMK SCREENING RP L8A1/L8A3	212	9,800	150	6,300			150	6,300	75	3,800
100	GRENADE, SMOKE SCREENING IR M76	112	11,500	91	9,000			91	9,000	38	4,400
101	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES		14,900		18,000		2,900		20,900		14,400
102	SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES		19,900		4,300		7,200		11,500		20,500
	MISCELLANEOUS										
103	AMMO COMPONENTS/SUPPORT, ALL TYPES		21,300		20,300				20,300		15,100
104	CAD/PAD		500		2,500				2,500		2,300
105	ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (MISC-AMMO)		11,000		5,200		1,500		6,700		8,300
106	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS				1,200				1,200		1,700
107	AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT		5,200		7,800				7,800		8,100
108	NITROGUANIDINE (LB)		25,000		23,200				23,200		24,800
109	COMP A-5				12,200				12,200		12,500
110	COMP C-4				9,500		-1,500		8,000		9,800
111	PBX 0280				3,800				3,800		3,900
112	COMP LX-14				3,800				3,800		4,000
113	HMX EXPL-805				5,700				5,700		5,900
114	WAR RESERVE STOCKPILING(EXPL/PROPELLANTS)								0		
115	AMMO 9MM/ELT		1,700		1,600				1,600		2,900
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS				99,400				99,400		174,300
	SUBTOTAL, AMMUNITION		1,995,700		1,900,100		60,300		1,960,400		2,087,400

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	AMMUNITION PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT										
116	PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		280,600		159,000		51,300		210,300		300,500
117	COMPONENTS FOR PROVE-OUT		14,000		8,700				8,700		16,400
118	LAYAWAY OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		20,500		22,900				22,900		19,700
119	JEFFERSON PROVING GROUND MODERNIZATION		2,000		2,200				2,200		
120	CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION PROGRAM		81,300						0		
121	PRODUCTION BASE MODERNIZATION		103,100		161,100		-22,800		138,300		
	SUBTOTAL, AMMUNITION PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT		501,500		353,900		28,500		382,400		336,600
	TOTAL, ARMY AMMUNITION		2,497,200		2,254,000		88,800		2,342,800		2,424,000

The administration requested approximately $2,254.0 million for Army ammunition procurement for fiscal year 1987. The request provided for a 11.9 percent reduction in ammunition procurement over fiscal year 1986 appropriated funding.

The committee recommends an additional $88.8 million for a total of $2,342.8 million. This represents a real growth reduction from fiscal year 1986 of 8.3%.

The committee remains concerned that the decreasing ammunition funding requests will seriously endanger our ammunition readiness. With the Congressionally mandated reductions in defense spending, adding substantial funds to the ammunition investment was not possible. A number of changes were made in the requested funds and quantities to better reflect current conditions. No undistributed reduction was made to these accounts, and any undistributed reductions made to other Army procurement accounts shall not reduce these accounts.

LIGHTWEIGHT MULTI-PURPOSE SYSTEM

The Army requested $82.5 million to continue procurement of AT-4 missiles under the Lightweight Multi-Purpose System program. The AT-4 missile was designed in Sweden and will be produced in the United States under license agreement. Under original Army plans, all missiles procured prior to and including Fiscal Year 1987 were to have been produced in Sweden. The remaining AT-4 missiles were to be produced in the U.S. The committee believes that the Army should initiate transition to U.S. production as soon as practicable. Therefore, the Army is authorized to obligate up to $28.2 million for initial production facilitization, low rate initial production, and U.S. government management for U.S. production in Fiscal Year 1987.

BINARY CHEMICAL MODERNIZATION PROGRAM

The administration requested a total of $1,135.2 million for the U.S. chemical deterrent program in fiscal year 1987. Of the total request, $814.4 million or 72% is for protective measures; $200.7 million or 18% is for retaliatory programs; and $120.1 million or 10% is for the demilitarization of existing unitary munitions. The funding profile is as follows:

CHEMICAL DETERRENT PROGRAM
(Dollars in Millions)

	FY87 Request	Recommendation	Change
PROTECTIVE MEASURES:			
RDT&E	227.57	227.57	0.0
Medical RDT&E	167.0	157.0	-10.0
O&M	184.1	184.1	0.0
Procurement	186.13	186.13	0.0
War Reserve	26.0	26.0	0.0
*(Milcon)	23.6	23.6	0.0
TOTAL	814.4	804.4	-10.0
RETALIATORY CAPABILITY:			
RDT&E	42.2	42.2	0.0
Procurement of Facilities	41.1	41.1	0.0
Procurement of Munitions	117.4	117.4	0.0
TOTAL	200.7	200.7	0.0
DEMILITARIZATION:			
RDT&E	9.8	9.8	0.0
O&M	60.5	60.5	0.0
Procurement	49.8	49.8	0.0
TOTAL	120.1	120.1	0.0

*Authorized under a separate title.

After several years of debate, the Congress in 1985 provided its approval for the modernization of the U.S. chemical deterrent with binary chemical munitions—provided that the President meets certain certification requirements. This historic shift in attitude toward this important program was based on several important factors.

First, it represented a recognition that the U.S. stockpile of unitary chemical weapons no longer posed an adequate deterrent. The vast majority of the weapons in our stockpile are of little or no military value. In addition, the Congress recognized that defensive measures alone are not an adequate response to the chemical warfare threat because of the tremendous degradation that troops experience while fighting in protective clothing. This highlights the need for a credible retaliatory capability

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, it was the view of the Congress that if the United States were to maintain a chemical deterrent, then this deterrent should consist of munitions that do not pose a potential safety risk to our own personnel. Binary chemical munitions, because they consist of two inert substances that do not form a lethal agent until after they are fired or released, have significantly improved safety and handling features over the unitary munitions that make up the U.S. chemical weapons stockpile today.

The Congress established certain certification requirements that the administration must meet prior to the initiation of binary production. According to the testimony of administration officials, progress is being made on these requirements and they should be completed in time for the scheduled October 1, 1986 production start-up of the 155mm binary artillery shell. In addition, progress is being made on those certification requirements that must be satisfied prior to the final assembly of binary munitions.

Included in these is a certification by the President that the United States had submitted a force goal to NATO for the modernization of the U.S. proportional share of NATO's chemical deterrent with binary munitions. While the provision in the Department of Defense Authorization Act, as amended by the Continuing Resolution for Fiscal Year 1986, stipulates that the North Atlantic Council formally adopt this force goal, the report language accompanying the Continuing Resolution explicitly refers to adoption by "the North Atlantic Alliance".

In view of France's withdrawal from NATO's military structure in 1967, the Alliance needed a separate forum to address issues related to defense—a forum in which France would not be seated. For this purpose, and with the agreement of France and the North Atlantic Council, the Defense Planning Committee was formed. In matters related to the integrated military structure, the Defense Planning Committee exercises the authority of the North Atlantic Council.

On May 15, 1986 NATO's Defense Planning Committee meeting in permanent session formally adopted the force goal relating to the binary chemical modernization program. The committee believes that the adoption of the force goal by the Defense Planning Committee satisfies the intent of the requirement in the Department of Defense Authorization Act. However, to eliminate any uncertainty in this regard, the committee has included bill language that makes the appropriate clarifying change to last year's act.

BIGEYE

The Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1986 denied funds for the production of the BIGEYE air-delivered bomb, and fenced funding for future production until 60 days after the Secretary of Defense submitted a report to the Congress on various technical aspects of the program. The committee is aware that initial operational testing by the Navy and Air Force has identified certain technical issues that need to be resolved before a commitment to full scale production is made. The committee is also aware of the recent General Accounting Office report on BIGEYE, and it encourages the Secretary of Defense to address the issues raised by this report in his report to the Congress. The committee is following closely the issue of BIGEYE's readiness for production, and it intends to carefully review the Secretary's report.

The committee understands that the technical issues identified in the test program involving the FMU-140 fuze and the FZU-37 initiator are being addressed. Therefore, provided that the committee is satisfied with the Secretary's report, it will support the administration's decision to enter into a limited initial production run on BIGEYE. The results of the second phase of operational testing, which is scheduled for the summer of 1986, will indicate whether sufficient progress has been made in resolving these technical issues to justify full-scale production in fiscal year 1988.

Demilitarization Program

The committee has received the Army's report on the accelerated destruction of the existing stockpile of unitary chemical weapons. The committee would like to commend the Army for the professional manner in which it carried out Congressional guidance. The committee is satisfied that the plan set forth in that report will meet the Congressionally mandated 1994 deadline, provided that there are not too many time consuming legal delays. However, in order to execute that plan, the committee understands that the Army will require significant additional resources above the amount contained in the request for the demilitarization program in fiscal year 1987.

While the Army's report provides a plan under which the existing stockpile of unitary chemical munitions can be destroyed on the most expedited basis, it is not clear that this is the most cost-effective plan. In addition, this plan would foreclose advanced demilitarization technologies—like "cryofracture"—that offer potential safety and cost advantages. On the other hand, the committee is aware that more cost-effective methods might not be able to meet the 1994 date.

However, in view of the serious constraints on the defense budget, the committee directs the Army to provide the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives a report on the most cost-effective demilitarization plan by October 1, 1986. This report, in addition to the one already received, will permit the committee to weigh the cost and schedule issues and reach a judgement about the most prudent demilitarization course to follow. In the meantime, the Army should proceed with the construction of the CAMDS facility on Johnston Island and the demilitarization plan funded in the fiscal year 1987 budget request.

Protective Mask

The Army has been developing a new protective mask to replace the M17 for well over a decade. This new mask is being designed for joint service use. The decision to terminate research and development and to begin production of a new mask has been delayed several times. In fact, funding was included in the request for the chemical deterrent program in fiscal year 1986 to begin procurement of a new mask.

The committee believes that there is a compelling requirement to get a new mask into the field with U.S. service personnel as soon as possible. Therefore, the committee encourages the Army to terminate development work on a new mask, select a design on a competitive basis among the several candidates, and to begin production of the new mask with fiscal year 1987 procurement funds. In addition, no procurement funds should be used to procure additional M17 masks.

Recommendation

In view of the high priority that the committee continues to attach to the modernization of all aspects of the U.S. chemical deterrent, the committee recommends full funding of the retaliatory and demilitarization portions of the Chemical Deterrent Program. However, in view of budgetary constraints, the committee recommends a reduction of $10.0 million in the research and development associated with protective measures.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES										
	TACTICAL VEHICLES										
1	CHASSIS TRAILER GEN 2 1/2 TON 2W M200A1	1,949	7,600	908	4,100			908	4,100		
2	CHASSIS, TRAILER, GP, 3 1/2T, 2W, M353			618	3,700			618	3,700		
3	DOLLY SET, TRANS SHELTER, 2 1/2T, M720								0	452	3,300
4	DOLLY SET, TRANS SHELTER, 5 1/4 T, M832								0	157	3,000
5	DOLLY SET, TRANS SHELTER, 7 1/2T, M1022	201	5,500	219	6,200			219	6,200	275	7,800
6	MOTORCYCLE, GED, 2W, ROUGH TERRAIN	333	2,000	2,732	7,100			2,732	7,100	2,942	7,800
7	SEMITRAILER BB/CONT 22 1/2T M871 C/S								0	920	15,900
8	SEMITRAILER BB/CONT 34T M872 C/S	169	3,400	286	6,400			286	6,400	342	7,600
9	SEMITRAILER, LB, 12T M270A1-M269A1	238	9,300						0		
10	SEMITRAILER, LOW BED, 40T M870 (C/S)	598	12,200	73	1,900			73	1,900	692	15,200
11	SEMITRAILER, LOW BED HET, XM1000								0	228	32,800
12	SEMITRAILER, TANK, 5000G	445	19,800	172	8,800			172	8,800	156	8,500
13	SEMITRAILER, TANK, 7500G, BULKHAUL			187	7,300			187	7,300	270	10,300
14	SEMITRAILER VAN ELECTRONIC 6T 2W M373A2								0	63	2,000
15	SEMITRAILER VAN SUPPLY 12T, 2W, M129A2C			242	7,000			242	7,000		
16	TRAILER, CARGO 3/4T, 2W, M101A2 W/E	943	3,500	1,476	5,600			1,476	5,600	3,461	12,700
17	TRAILER, CARGO, 1 1/2T, 2W, M105A2	2,695	11,100						0	4,166	18,200
18	TRAILER, HEAVY, EXPANDED MOBILITY			286	7,400			286	7,400	313	8,300
19	TRAILER TANK WATER 400G 1 1/[illegible] 2W M149A1	650	4,000	966	5,900			966	5,900	3,064	18,400
20	HI MOB MULTI-PURP WHLD VEH (HMMWV)(MYP)	12,132	313,300	12,842	330,600			12,842	330,600	4,555	128,500
21	COMMERCIAL UTILITY AND CARGO VEHICLE								0		
22	SMALL UNIT SUPPORT VEHICLE (SUSV)	125	13,800	241	26,200			241	26,200	287	32,200
23	TRUCK, 5T, 6X6, ABT (MYP)	2,097	216,800						0	3,729	400,000
24	TRUCK, 10T, 8X8, ABT (MYP)	651	116,100	1,523	234,300		-50,000	1,523	184,300	396	70,400
25	TRUCK, TRACTOR, LINE HAUL, M915A1								0	720	58,100
26	TRUCK, TRACTOR, YARD TYPE, M878 (C/S)	42	3,100						0		
27	MODIFICATION OF IN-SERVICE EQUIPMENT		1,500		3,800				3,800		15,500

37

						COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION					
		FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION	
LINE NO.	PROGRAM	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
28	SHOP EQUIPMENT, AUTO MAINT & REP	111	900	306	2,500			306	2,500	284	2,500
29	ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (TAC VEH)		1,700		1,900				1,900		1,400
	NON TACTICAL VEHICLES										
30	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	2,464	30,000	480	13,800			480	13,800	688	10,800
31	GENERAL PURPOSE VEHICLES	3,765	39,900	2,246	34,900			2,246	34,900	2,324	39,300
32	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES	802	13,000	639	9,700			639	9,700	757	14,000
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES										
33	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		135,000		136,600				136,600		126,500
34	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TAC)								0		1,800
	SUBTOTAL, TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES		963,500		865,700		-50,000		815,700		1,072,800
	COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT										
	TELECOMM EQUIP - READ CMD COMM										
35	JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM)		300		1,800				1,800		3,700
36	CINCS INITIATIVE				4,100				4,100		4,700
37	CLASSIFIED PROJECT 9WW		14,200		9,100				9,100		8,200
	TELECOMM EQUIP JOINT TACTICAL COMM PR										
38	MOD RCRD TFC TERM (MRTT)		29,300		31,900				31,900		41,300
39	DIG GROUP MULTIIPLEXER (DGM)		20,400		10,800				10,800		19,500
40	RPTR/TERM ASSMBLGS		15,700		19,900				19,900		29,100
41	RADIO TERMINALS AN/TRC 170		29,200		32,400				32,400		38,800
42	MAINTENANCE SYSTEM AN/ARM 164				3,300				3,300		
43	UNIT LEVEL SWITCHES		10,500		12,200				12,200		42,900
44	COM SYS CON EL AN/TYQ-16		15,900		23,600				23,600		33,600
45	DIG NSEC VIER TA 954	4,500	4,000	4,600	3,900			4,600	3,900	7,200	6,500
46	ANDVT TAC TERM, CV-3591	159	4,000	159	3,900			159	3,900	135	5,300
47	LIGHTWEIGHT DIGITAL FACSIMILE			85	1,200			85	1,200	440	6,200
48	MOB SUBSCRIBER EQUIP		335,300		903,700				903,700		1,019,800
49	MOD OF IN SVC EQ (TRI-TAC)		22,500		9,900				9,900		14,400
	TELECOMM EQUIP-COMBAT SUPPORT COMM										
50	COMM SYS (HTLD)		8,500						0		
51	SINCGARS	400	102,100	16,000	204,000		-150,000	16,000	54,000	19,000	309,000

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
52	DIGITAL DATA GENERATOR BOX SG-1139								0		
53	HAND CRANK GENERATOR, G-76			358	2,500			358	2,500		
54	IHF RADIO MODS								0		14,600
55	IMP HF RADIO FAMILY		26,600		11,100				11,100		11,600
56	OPTICAL LONG HAUL TRAN SYS			620	9,300			620	9,300	1,250	11,000
57	PWR SUPPLY PP-6148/U	115	900	609	4,000			609	4,000	430	2,700
58	PULSE FORM RESTORER TD-206								0		
59	RADIO SET AN/PRC-70	305	11,600						0		
60	SOF MOD RADIOS				4,500				4,500		3,200
61	ANTENNA GROUP OE-254	5,170	2,500	13,540	6,500			13,540	6,500	10,650	5,200
62	SMALL UNIT TRANS AN/PRC - 68	510	1,000						0		
63	SMALL UNIT TRANSCEIVER				3,700				3,700		7,000
64	STEER NULL ANT PROC, CP-1380		15,400						0		
65	TELETYPEWRITER TERMINAL AN/UGC-74	155	2,100						0		
66	VEHICULAR INTERCOM SYSTEM			100	10,200			100	10,200	900	13,300
67	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (CSC)		18,856		26,400				26,400		20,644
68	RDF COMM(S.W. ASIA)		19,500		14,900				14,900		21,300
69	ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (CSC-C-E)		7,100		5,900				5,900		4,600
70	SPEC OPS COMM SUP ELMT		11,300		15,200				15,200		1,800
	TELECOMM EQUIP - NMCS WIDE SUPPORT, ARM										
71	SECURE CONFERENCING PROJECT				4,500				4,500		4,400
	TELECOMM EQUIP - STARCOM NON-DCS										
72	AR TELECOM AUTO PR (ATCAP)		9,200		3,200				3,200		5,600
73	C-E FACILITIES/PROJECTS		18,800		4,700				4,700		10,500
74	SOUTHCOM C3 UPGRADE		13,800		16,000				16,000		15,400
75	ELECTROMAG COMP PROG(EMCP)		600		500				500		600
	LONG-HAUL COM (DCS)										
76	AUTODIN (DCS)		4,800						0		
77	DEFENSE DATA NETWORK (DDN)		6,500						0		
78	SECURE VOICE IMPRV PROG (SVIP)								0		
79	TRANSMISSION MEDIA (EUCOM)		16,200		11,100				11,100		12,900
80	TRANSMISSION MEDIA (PACOM)		30,800		15,800				15,800		6,300
81	WW TECH CON IMP PR(WWTCIP)		5,300		2,700				2,700		4,000

39

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	TELECOMM EQUIP - SATCOM-GRD ENVIRON										
82	DIGITAL EQUIPMENT (DSCS)		39,900		29,300				29,300		29,000
83	INTERCONNECT FACILITY (DSCS)		7,900		2,200				2,200		4,900
84	JAM RESISTANT SECURE COM (JRSC)		19,600		9,300				9,300		17,200
85	MED SAT TERM AN/GSC		62,000						0		
86	SPRD SPEC MUL ACC (DSCS)		18,000						0		
87	DSCS OPERATIONS CONTROL SYS (DOCS)		31,200		80,300				80,300		66,200
88	MOD IN-SVC EQUIP (DSCS)		8,500						0		
89	MPK SAT UHF TERM, AN/PSC-3	90	3,900	115	5,000			115	5,000	115	5,000
90	VEH SAT UHF TERM, AN/VSC-7	24	1,400	30	1,400			30	1,400	30	1,400
91	SINGLE CHANNEL OBJECT TACT TERM (SCOTT)								0	16	32,700
92	MOD IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT)		53,300		7,000				7,000		4,500
	TELECOMM EQUIP - EUCOM C3 SYSTEM										
93	EUCOM C3 (NWS)		98,600		68,400				68,400		16,700
94	PACOM C3(NWS)				13,000				13,000		15,000
95	EUCOM ALTERNATE SPT HQ (ASH)		7,700		3,800				3,800		
96	USAREUR C2 PROJECT				7,700				7,700		7,800
	TELECOMM EQUIP - COMSEC EQUIPMENT										
97	AUTO KEY DC KGX-93/TSEC		4,300		4,100				4,100		4,200
98	SEC VO IMPRV PRG (COMSEC)		12,000		13,700				13,700		19,100
99	LOOP KEY GEN TSEC/KG-82	1,544	2,100						0		
100	DED LOOP ENCRYP DEV KG-84	7,067	31,800	4,155	18,700			4,155	18,700	4,422	19,900
101	TNK ENCRP DEV TSEC/KG-93	218	2,200	208	2,100			208	2,100	267	2,700
102	TSEC/KG-94		7,800		12,300				12,300		9,900
103	TSEC/KG-95 KEY GENERATOR								0		
104	INT LEV T SET TSEC/ST-34	14	800						0		
105	DIG SUB VOICE TSEC/KY-68	525	2,000						0		
106	TSEC/KY-90	138	5,400						0		
107	KEY GENERATOR, TSEC/KG-87	33	2,000	30	1,800			30	1,800	21	1,300
108	KGV-6/TSEC								0		
109	COMSEC MODULE, TSEC/KGV-13	144	3,800	753	19,900			753	19,900	253	6,700
110	FREQ MODULE, KGV-10/TSEC	15,867	13,900	18,200	9,100			18,200	9,100	27,600	13,800
111	SPEECH SECUR EQ TSEC/KY-57		35,000						0		
112	SPEECH SECUR EQ TSEC/KY-58								0		

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
113	TSEC/KYV-5 (VACTOR) SECURE EQUIP	160	900	89	500			89	500	267	1,500
114	TEMPEST (COMSEC)		1,100		700				700		1,200
115	KOK-13/TSEC (KDC)			21	1,900			21	1,900	9	800
116	TSEC/KGV-8 (THORNTON) SECURE MODULE			17	600			17	600	163	3,100
117	BERDAN KGV-9								0		
118	TSEC/KGV-11/SECURE MODULE		1,300		1,400				1,400		1,500
119	UMSTEAD CC (CI-11-1)		3,000						0		
120	UMSTEAD RT (CI-11-2)		6,800						0		
121	BATSON II, TSEC/CI-14		8,400						0		
122	ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (COMSEC)		8,200		11,700				11,700		7,700
	TELECOMM EQUIP - BASE COMM										
123	BASE COMM (CONUS)		34,500		35,800				35,800		36,900
124	LOCAL AREA NETWORK (LAN)				1,700				1,700		10,600
125	BASE COMM (EUCOM)		6,800		7,900				7,900		13,100
126	BASE COMM (PACOM)		4,000		1,600				1,600		6,000
127	DA COMD + CON SYS (DACCS)		10,300						0		
128	ARMY OPNS CTR		5,000		4,300				4,300		
129	PENTAGON TELECOM CTR (PTC)		9,800		4,100				4,100		
	TMDE FOR TELECOMM										
130	TMDE MODERNIZATION		27,000		16,900				16,900		19,400
	OTHER ELECT SYS/EQUIP - INTELLIGENCE SU										
131	4TH PSYOP GROUP				12,500				12,500		11,100
132	ALL-SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM				[ ]				[ ]		[ ]
133	COMMANDERS TACTICAL TERMINAL				[ ]				[ ]		[ ]
134	TRAILBLAZER	1	19,200		[ ]				[ ]		
135	TAC ELEC SURV SYS		15,800		4,000				4,000		3,500
136	MANPACK RADIO DF SYSTEM	12	7,000		[ ]				[ ]		[ ]
137	TEAM PACK	4	6,000								
138	MOD IN SER EQ (INT SPT) TIARA		20,200		37,300				37,300		35,900
139	ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (INT SPT-C-E)		5,600		500				500		100
140	FT DEVENS TRAINING SUPPORT		400		400				400		500
141	TROJAN		9,200		[ ]				[ ]		[ ]

		FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
LINE NO.	PROGRAM	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	OTHER ELECT SYS/EQUIP - GEN DEF INTEL P										
142	INTEL DATA HANDLING SYSTEM		[ ]		[ ]				[ ]		[ ]
143	TECH RECON AND SURV SYSTEM		[ ]		[ ]				[ ]		[ ]
144	ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (FCI/S&IA-C-E)		[ ]		[ ]				[ ]		[ ]
145	ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (GDIP-C-E)		[ ]		[ ]				[ ]		[ ]
	OTHER ELEC SYS/EQUIP - AUTO DATA PROCE										
146	VERT INSTL AUTO BASELINE (VIABLE-BASOPS)		18,700		41,800				41,800		36,700
147	VIABLE INSTALLATIONS IN EUROPE & WESTCOM								0		
148	BATTERY COMPUTER SYSTEM	89	17,700	66	11,000			66	11,000		
149	AMC FIVE YEAR ADP PROGRAM				4,000				4,000		5,000
150	ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACT DATA SYS		25,600						0		10,700
151	ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM-ADDS		21,600		75,500				75,500		162,300
152	TRADOC AUTOMATION				3,700				3,700		1,900
153	USAREUR TACTICAL AUTOMATION		2,200		2,000				2,000		2,100
154	LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUP. (LCSS)		3,500		9,100				9,100		6,500
155	ADPE FOR NON TAC MGT INFO SYS		42,100		40,400				40,400		38,700
156	SUPERCOMPUTERS				22,900				22,900		24,300
157	ARMY CORPORATE DATABASE				900				900		2,400
158	SOLDIER DATA TAG								0		5,200
159	PROJECT 80X PHASE II				12,900				12,900		17,400
160	TRANS OF PERS PROP				2,900				2,900		1,200
161	STD ARMY AUTO CONTRACT SY				6,800				6,800		6,800
162	DIGITAL MESSAGE DEVICE								0		
163	FIRE SUPPORT TEAM DIGITAL MESSAGE	427	17,200	381	17,000			381	17,000	131	5,600
164	FORWARD ENTRY DEVICE				12,000				12,000		17,900
165	NON-CENTRALLY MANAGED ITEMS		105,300						0		
166	MANUEVER CONTROL SYS		59,900		56,900				56,900		57,400
167	MOD IN-SVC CMD/CONTROL (C2)		2,900						0		
168	CORPS/THEATER ADP SVC CTR (CTASC)				9,700				9,700		20,400
169	TACT ARMY CMBT COMPT SY(TACCS)	2,185	44,600	1,960	42,900			1,960	42,900	822	16,800
170	DECENTIZED AUTO SER SUP SY MOD 'B'								0		
171	COMPUTER BALLISTICS: MORTAR XM-23	880	6,000						0		
172	CSS LOG APPLC AUTO MARK/READ SYMBS(LOG MARS		10,600		11,400				11,400		12,300
173	WWMCCS INFORMATION SYSTEM (WIS)		7,100		36,200				36,200		29,000
174	UNIT LEVEL COMPUTER (ULC).		5,500						0		

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	AUDIO VISUAL										
175	AFRTS (AUDIO VISUAL)		7,800		8,000				8,000		6,700
176	DIG STRG & RTRVL ENGRG DATA SYS (DSREDS)		24,300						0		
177	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000 (A/V C E)		11,300		9,100				9,100		17,600
	OTHER ELECT SYS/EQUIP - ELECTRONIC WARF										
178	COUNTERMEASURES AN/TLQ-17A	9	5,700						0		[ ]
179	JAMMER, HAND EMPLACED, EXPENDABLE								0		[ ]
180	TACJAM, AN/MLQ-34	5	19,000	11	33,000			11	33,000		[ ]
181	TACTICAL DECEPTION (TAC-D)		5,200						0		[ ]
182	MOD IN SVC EQUIP (EW)		2,100		8,300				8,300		19,300
183	ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (EW-C-E)		2,900		800				800		800
	OTHER ELECT SYS/EQUIP TACTICAL ELECTR										
184	BATTERY CHARGER PP-7286/U	540	3,500	535	3,000			535	3,000	1,590	8,200
185	POWER SUPPLY, PP-6224	1,434	1,900	2,400	3,200			2,400	3,200	2,400	3,200
186	COMPUTER/INDICATOR, CP-696/PD	842	4,000	1,102	3,700			1,102	3,700	1,572	4,800
187	METEROLOGICAL DATA SYS (FAMAS)	21	33,000	20	32,800			20	32,900	20	33,700
188	GROUND/VEHICLE LASER LOC DESIGNATOR (G/V	210	45,000						0		
189	HAND HELD LASER RANGEFINDER AN/GVS-5			1,085	6,800			1,085	6,800	1,648	10,500
190	INTRUSION DETECTION DEVICES		16,600		20,800				20,800		7,000
191	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM	127	9,700	377	5,200			377	5,200	400	9,900
192	POSITION/AZIMUTH DETERMINING SYS (PADS)	50	19,900	107	35,700			107	35,700	114	37,300
193	TAM-6 NIGHT SIGHT MAINTENANCE FACILITY	17	4,200						0		
194	AN/TAM-3 TEST SET, NIGHT VISION SIGHT	83	2,300						0		
195	NIGHT OBS DEVICE LONG RANGE AN/TAS-6								0	356	29,700
196	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES		64,900		63,200				63,200		70,000
197	NIGHT VISION SIGHT INDIV WPN AN/PVS-4	3,611	9,900	3,947	10,000			3,947	10,000	5,621	14,600
198	POS LOCATION REPORTING SYS (PLRS) (MYP)		45,100		4,000				4,000		
199	RADIAC SET AN/VDR-2	629	2,000	3,459	4,000			3,459	4,000	5,688	6,300
200	REMBASS TIARA		22,000						0		
201	RPV TA/DESIGN AERIAL RECON SYS (TADARS)		21,900		117,700		-67,700		50,000		193,300
202	JOINT STARS (ARMY)				63,400				63,400		107,900
203	SHOP SHELTER MTD ASM-189			37	2,200			37	2,200	178	10,800
204	SHOP SHELTER MTD(STOR) AN/ASM-190								0	69	3,300
205	TEST SET, RADAR, AN/TPM-25								0	149	4,900

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
206	SHOP SHELTER MDT-REP AN/ASM-146			63	2,100			63	2,100		
207	MODIFICATION OF IN SERVICE EQ (TAC EL)		3,500		38,500				38,500		41,500
208	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000 (TACT ELEC-C-E)		9,500		8,400				8,400		9,600
	TMDE FOR TACTICAL ELECTRONICS										
209	TEST STA, ELECTRONIC EQUIP, AN/USM-410	3	8,900						0		
210	BASE SHOP TEST FACILITY								0	4	21,100
211	CONTACT TEST SET								0	8	7,300
212	TMDE FOR STE/ICE	937	5,600	1,386	6,500			1,386	6,500	1,500	7,700
213	CORE ELECTRONIC AUTO TEST (STE-X)	115	8,500	39	3,000			39	3,000	91	6,500
	OTHER ELECT SYS/EQUIP SUP EQUIP AND F										
214	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		189,200		183,200				183,200		202,600
215	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		14,600		11,400				11,400		13,000
216	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		205,000		260,300				260,300		308,900
217	WAR RESERVE SPARES		18,000						0		
218	SPECIAL PROGRAMS		95,000		115,800				115,800		208,500
219	QUICK RETURN ON INVESTMENT (QRIP) PGM		500						0		
220	PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENT FUNDING		40,700		31,100				31,100		400
221	PROD ENHANCING CAP INVESTMENT PROG (PECIP)		1,000		21,800				21,800		
222	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E)		5,000		8,100				8,100		3,100
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		36,800		251,600				251,600		250,800
	SUBTOTAL, COMMUNICATIONS & ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT		2,936,856		3,698,000		-217,700		3,480,300		4,351,944
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
	CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT										
223	SIM DET CHEM AGENT AUTO ALARM XM81	692	4,700						0		
224	DECONTAMINATE APP PWR DR LT WT XM17	548	6,400	343	3,900			343	3,900	588	7,000
225	MASK, PROTECTIVE, NBC	110,300	30,300	66,884	19,900			66,884	19,900	301,689	61,700
226	CHEMICAL AGENT MONITOR	3,729	19,400						0	3,995	19,600
227	SIMP COLL PROT EQUIP XM20	344	3,900	445	4,100			445	4,100	675	5,800
228	MODULAR/COLL PROT EQUIP FOR VV AND S	100	3,100						0	742	10,700
229	AUTO CHEMICAL AGENT ALARM (ACADA), XM22			346	9,000			346	9,000	438	7,100
230	GEN SET, SMOKE, MECH: PUL JET, XM157	145	4,200	247	7,000			247	7,000		
231	MODS IN SVC (CHEM)								0		

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	BRIDGING EQUIPMENT										
232	RIBBON BRIDGE ERECTION BOAT	185	25,400	144	19,200			144	19,200	144	18,900
233	BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON, INTERIOR BAY	188	7,100	194	7,200			194	7,200	206	7,500
234	BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON, RAMP	87	3,800	78	3,200			78	3,200	80	3,500
235	BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON, TRANSPORTER	163	18,000	165	18,200			165	18,200	164	18,500
236	ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M(BRIDGING)		900		1,300				1,300		1,800
	ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT										
237	GEMSS AUX MINE DISPNSR XM138 (FLIPPER)	237	2,000	444	3,900			444	3,900	478	4,000
238	DISPENSER MINE XM139			6	1,700			6	1,700	6	1,500
239	MIXER/PUMPER UNIT (MPU) TEXS								0	44	13,000
240	MARKING SYS, CLEAR LANE	74	3,000	88	3,200			88	3,200	57	2,000
241	E DET SET, MINE, MET/NON-MET, AN/PRS-8	6,010	8,100						0	4,155	5,600
242	DETECTING SET, MINE, AN/PSS-12			4,665	4,900			4,665	4,900	3,135	[illegible]
243	MINE PLOW			135	5,500			135	5,500	57	[illegible]
244	MINE CLEARING ROLLER	50	3,500	55	3,700			55	3,700	109	7,600
245	REMOTE CONTROL UNIT(MOPMS)	581	4,600	1,560	9,800			1,560	9,800	1,560	9,600
246	SURVEY SET DISTANCE MEASURING INFRARED			278	2,800			278	2,800		
247	M-9 ARMORED COMBAT EARTHMOVER (ACE) (MYP	22	42,400	21	30,400			21	30,400	181	159,100
248	ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M(ENG NON-CONST)		3,300		900				900		900
	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
249	AIR CONDITIONERS VARIOUS SIZE/CAPACITIES		14,800		32,200				32,200		14,700
250	FIELD KITCHEN,MOBILE, TRL MTD.	337	5,300	836	13,100			836	13,100	971	15,700
251	MODULAR FIELD KITCHEN			465	11,600			465	11,600	617	15,200
252	DIVING EQUIPMENT		400		1,800				1,800		3,400
253	FIRETRUCKS		9,000		16,000				16,000		13,700
254	HEATER DUCT TYPE, 250,000/400,000 BTU								0	1,013	4,800
255	LAUNDRY UNIT/TRL MTD			110	7,300			110	7,300	110	7,000
256	TAG PRINTING AND BINDING EQUIPMENT		5,400		4,300				4,300		5,200
257	ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (CSS-EQ)		8,700		11,300				11,300		20,700
258	MODIFICATIONS OF IN SERVICE EQUIP (CSE)		3,800		8,900				8,900		5,000
	PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT										
259	TANK ASSEMBLY FAB COLL POL 50000 G	335	5,100	282	4,600			282	4,600	271	4,400
260	FORWARD AREA REFUELING EQUIPMENT (FARE)			300	2,800			300	2,800	300	3,000
261	TANK ASSEMBLY FAB COLLAPSIBLE POL 10000G	492	5,800	600	6,600			600	6,600	700	7,900

45

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
262	TANK ASSY, FAB COLLAPS, 20,000 GAL POL			652	6,300			652	6,300		
263	TANK/PUMP UNIT LIQ DISP F/TRK MOUNTING			109	1,000			109	1,000	639	5,900
264	LABORATORY, PETROLEUM, SEMI-TRLR MTO			3	3,200			3	3,200	4	3,600
265	PUMP ASSY LIQ GAS WHL 4 IN OUT 350 GPM	361	5,800	744	12,200			744	12,200		
266	PUMP CENTRIFUGAL 4X4 DED								0		
267	PIPELINE FOR TUSA								0		
268	SWA PETROLEUM DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM		38,900		39,300				39,300		43,400
269	ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (POL)		3,500		6,700				6,700		3,400
	WATER EQUIPMENT										
270	WTR PUR UNIT REV OS 3000 GPH (ROWPU)	24	14,000	80	33,900		-20,000	80	13,900	54	21,400
271	WATER PUR UNIT, REV OSMOSIS, 600GPH (ROW	92	24,000	111	29,500		-20,000	111	9,500	134	36,800
272	WATER STOR AND DIST SYS 800,000 GAL								0		
273	WATER STOR DIST SYS 1,000,000 GAL								0		
274	TACTICAL WATER DISTR SYS	2	8,300						0	2	8,600
275	FWD AREA WTR POINT SUP SYSTEM								0		
276	TANK, FABRIC, COLL, WTR, 3000 GAL (SMFT)								0		
277	TANK, FAB COLLAPS, 3000 GAL, WATER(ONION)			1,200	2,900			1,200	2,900		
278	TANK, FABRIC, COLL, WTR, SEMI-TRLR MTD 5M(SM	140	1,600						0		
279	SMALL MOBILE WATER CHILLER (SMWC)	274	2,200	167	1,500			167	1,500		
280	DRILL MACH, WELL 600FT								0		
281	PUMP CENTRIFUGAL, 65GPM	2,183	3,400	1,230	2,100			1,230	2,100		
282	ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (WATER EQ)		1,900		2,500				2,500		4,800
	MEDICAL EQUIPMENT										
283	DEPLOYABLE MEDICAL SYSTEM (DMS)		96,700		88,800				88,800		98,600
284	CBT SUP EQUIP MEDICAL		98,700		48,100				48,100		53,600
285	MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		83,900		70,800				70,800		104,600
	MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT										
286	SHOP EQ CONTACT MAINTENACE TRK MTD (MYP)	1,330	27,000						0	640	12,200
287	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)								0		
288	SHOP EQUIPMENT, ORG REPAIR, TRK MTD								0		
289	WELDING SHOP, TRAILER MTD	236	9,800	236	9,700			236	9,700	240	9,800
290	SHOP EQ ELECTRICAL RPR SEMI-TRL MTD	107	13,500	114	14,500			114	14,500	75	9,600
291	STEAM CLEANER			930	5,000			930	5,000	1,216	10,400
292	E WELDING MACHINE ELEC ARC 350 AMP (CC-CP)			510	5,700			510	5,700		

46

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
293	BUILDING, PRE-FAB, RELOCATABLE				1,200				1,200		1,200
294	CALIBRATION SET SUPPORT		7,700		12,700				12,700		12,700
295	ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (MAINT EQ)		9,500		10,300				10,300		10,900
	CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT										
296	GRADER, ROAD MOTORIZED, HVY, 6X4 (CCE)								0		
297	LOADER, SCOOP TYPE, DD 4WHL, 2-1/2 CU YD								0		
298	TRACTOR FULL TRACKED LOW SPEED DD MED	129	26,400	357	73,600		-50,000	357	23,600		
299	SMALL EMPLACEMENT EXCAVATOR (SEE)	356	25,300	314	25,000			314	25,000	469	36,300
300	CRANE, WHL MTD, HYDRAULIC 7 1/2 TON								0	225	14,200
301	COMPRESSOR, AIR ROTARY, 250 CFM, 100 PSI								0		
302	MODS OF IN SERVICE EQUIP (CONST EQUIP)				100				100		200
303	ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (CONST EQUIP)		6,000		700				700		6,600
	RAIL FLOAT CONTAINERIZATION EQUIPMENT										
304	LANDING, CRAFT, UTILITY	5	22,900	6	29,300			6	29,300	5	25,200
305	TUG INLAND AND COASTAL WATERWAYS			2	30,100			2	30,100		
306	LOGISTIC SUPPORT VESSEL (LSV)			1	19,900			1	19,900	1	19,700
307	RO/RO DISCHARGE PLATFORM	2	11,200						0		
308	CAUSEWAY STSTEMS		12,900	5	28,200			5	28,200	5	21,600
309	ARAPAHO		5,000						0		
310	RAILWAY CAR, TANK, POL, 20000G			209	9,800			209	9,800		100
311	RAILWAY CAR, FLAT, 140 TON								0		
312	SHIPPING CONTAINER								0		
313	MODIFICATIONS OF IN-SERV EQ (FLOAT/RAIL)		1,000		5,700				5,700		13,600
314	ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (FLOAT/RAIL)		4,200		1,000				1,000		3,400
	GENERATORS										
315	GEN AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP	4,919	90,000	5,912	115,900		-10,000	5,912	105,900	6,840	115,200
	MATERIEL HANDLING EQUIPMENT										
316	TRUCK, FORK LIFT, CBD, PT, 4000 LB.			465	13,300			465	13,300	423	12,600
317	TRUCK, FORK LIFT, CBD, PT, 6000 LB.	354	13,500	304	12,300			304	12,300	250	10,600
318	TRUCK, FORK LIFT, GE, SRT, 2000 LB	123	2,900						0		
319	TRUCK, FORK LIFT, DE, PT, RT, 10000 LB								0	320	33,700
320	TRUCK, FORK LIFT, DE, PT, RT, 6000 LB			206	21,000			206	21,000	260	28,400
321	TRUCK, FORK LIFT, ELEC, SRT, 6000 LB	116	4,600						0		
322	TRK FORK LFT ELC SRT FRT/SIDE LDR	23	2,000						0		

47

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
323	TRUCK, FORK LIFT, ELEC, SRT, 4000 LB	670	12,900	57	1,700			57	1,700		
324	65 TON CRANE	11	6,200	91	42,600		-12,600	91	30,000	90	42,700
325	ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (MHE)		5,000		2,400				2,400		8,000
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
326	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		37,700		54,400				54,400		55,600
327	BASE LEVEL COM'L EQUIPMENT								0		
328	AREA ORIENTED DEPOT UPGRADE		83,200		60,500				60,500		
329	PROD ENHANCING CAPITAL INVEST PRGM								0		
330	QUICK RETURN ON INVESTMENT PROGRAM								0		
331	PROJECT RESHAPE (HQ DARCOM)		6,000						0		
332	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH)		7,900		34,400				34,400		12,000
333	OSD PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENT FUNDING				4,900				4,900		
334	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING		11,200		13,300				13,300		18,000
335	ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (OTH SPT EQ)		600		1,000				1,000		900
336	HOST NATION SUPPORT - EUROPE		41,000		41,900				41,900		18,200
337	NATIONAL TRAINING CTR SUP		13,300		10,800				10,800		5,000
338	SWA STAGING BASES		6,400						0		6,200
339	TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM		177,800		186,100				186,100		235,400
340	SPECIAL PROGRAMS								0		16,200
341	BCE (NCMI)				61,600				61,600		42,500
342	PECIP (NCMI)				6,500				6,500		7,400
343	QRIP (NCMI)				9,100				9,100		10,300
	SUBTOTAL, OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		1,339,900		1,605,300		-112,600		1,492,700		1,765,200
	UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION		---		---		-220,700		-220,700		---
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		---		[ ]		-8,700		-8,700		---
	TOTAL, ARMY OTHER PROCUREMENT		5,240,256		6,169,000		-609,700		5,559,300		7,189,944

MOBILE SUBSCRIBER EQUIPMENT

The committee understands the considerable advantage in procuring Mobile Subscriber Equipment (MSE) with the maximum possible number of off-the-shelf components. The committee is, however, aware of concern about the adequacy of the telephone keypad being used, particularly in a cold weather and/or chemical environment. Originally designed for use on the TRI-TAC system, the keypad does not appear, either in size or construction, to be well designed for use in combat by personnel in front line units. The committee therefore urges the Army to study the experience of other nations with similar systems, to explore the need for and feasibility of a telephone keypad better suited for use in combat, and to phase in any redesigned keypad as a part of a Product Improvement Program (PIP).

SINGLE CHANNEL GROUND AND AIRBORNE RADIO SYSTEM (SINCGARS)

The administration requested $204.0 million for the procurement of 16,000 Single Channel Ground and Airborne Radio Systems (SINCGARS). SINCGARS is a lightweight, portable, VHF-FM combat net radio with both voice and data capabilities. It is equipped with advanced ECCM features.

As a result of technical difficulties, SINCGARS will not be ready for production until approximately the fourth quarter of fiscal year 1987. Procurement funds were provided in both 1985 and 1986, but no radios have been accepted because the manufacturer has failed to demonstrate that SINCGARS meets the contract specification for reliability. SINCGARS is currently achieving reliability rates of 300 hours (between failures), well short of the 1,250 hour contract specification. Follow-on Test and Evaluation (FOT&E) is now scheduled for February-April 1987, and the production decision is not expected until May 1987.

The program delays may cause a fixed price production option (for the procurement of 16,000 units in Option III) to lapse, thereby requiring renegotiation.

The committee believes that the manufacturer's management efforts on the SINCGARS program have been unsatisfactory, and insists that Option III, when renegotiated, shall not cost the government any more than would have been paid under the lapsed fixed price agreement. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide written notification to the committee when those renegotiations have been concluded.

Further, while the acquisition strategy for SINCGARS anticipates a leader-follower second source, the second source has not yet been selected. The committee believes that a vigorously competitive acquisition program will be essential to avoid program cost growth. Since it will require three years before an alternate source is fully competitive, the committee strongly encourages the Army to take all necessary steps to accelerate the selection and qualification of the second source.

The committee is advised that as a result of the postponement of the SINCGARS production decision, the full amount requested in fiscal year 1987 will not be required. The committee therefore recommends authorization of $54.0 million for the procurement of SINCGARS in fiscal year 1987, a reduction of $150.0 million from the administration's request.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT										
1	A 6E/F (ATTACK) INTRUDER (MYP)	11	274,845	11	278,893			11	278,893	12	617,261
2	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		20,056		80,032				80,032		113,453
3	EA 6B (ELECTRONIC WARFARE) PROWLER		417,608	12	417,686			12	417,686	12	428,991
4	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		23,798		22,008				22,008		22,291
5	AV 8B (V/STOL) HARRIER	46	768,380	42	623,284			42	623,284	42	776,326
6	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		83,073		77,002				77,002		80,406
7	F 14A/D (FIGHTER) TOMCAT	18	637,753	15	541,063			15	541,063	12	758,737
8	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		119,185		127,724				127,724		178,377
9	F/A 18 (FIGHTER) HORNET (MYP)	84	2,176,279	120	2,896,374	-24	-430,000	96	2,466,374	132	3,124,289
10	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		201,645		405,900		-100,000		305,900		348,100
11	CH/MH 53E (HELO) SUPER STALLION (MYP)	14	225,535	14	189,034			14	189,034	14	202,198
12	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		33,300		30,900				30,900		22,500
13	V 22 OSPREY								0		103,514
14	AH 1T (HELICOPTER) SEA COBRA	22	188,811		36,212				36,212		3,203
15	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)								0		
16	SH 60B (ASW HELO) SEAHAWK	16	253,268	17	199,651			17	199,651	6	131,310
17	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		52,683		21,121				21,121		22,126
18	SH 60F (CV ASW HELO)			7	138,770			7	138,770	18	247,702
19	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		30,000		29,361				29,361		30,599
20	P 3C (PATROL) ORION	9	322,871	9	312,388			9	312,388	9	290,591
21	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		89,208		93,198				93,198		22,088
22	E 2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE	6	307,098	6	286,483			6	286,483	6	322,291
23	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		30,036		24,120				24,120		25,986
24	SH 2F (ASW HELO) SEASPRITE	6	57,628	6	52,798	-6	-52,796	0	0		
25	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		6,432						0		
	SUBTOTAL, COMBAT AIRCRAFT		6,299,596		6,884,002		-582,798		6,301,204		7,872,339

						COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION					
		FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION	
LINE NO.	PROGRAM	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT										
26	C-9 SKYTRAIN II								0		
27	UC-12B	12	25,604						0		
28	C-20	2	38,385						0		
29	C-2 (MYP)	8	134,640	9	99,718			9	99,718		1,300
30	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		35,200						0		
	SUBTOTAL, AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT		233,829		99,718		0		99,718		1,300
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT										
31	T-34C	19	23,650						0		
32	ADVERSARY (F-16)	12	110,967						0		
33	T-45TS GOSHAWK								0	12	340,428
34	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)				56,374				56,374		30,374
35	TH-57								0		
	SUBTOTAL, TRAINER AIRCRAFT		134,617		56,374		0		56,374		370,802
	OTHER AIRCRAFT										
36	KC-130T (TANKER) HERCULES								0		
37	TANKER CONVERSIONS		105,558						0		
38	E-6A	2	285,295	3	226,619			3	226,619	3	269,625
39	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		55,946		72,879				72,879		40,956
40	UH-60A								0		
41	VH-60	9	102,800		24,706				24,706		
42	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)								0		
	SUBTOTAL, OTHER AIRCRAFT		549,599		324,204		0		324,204		310,581
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT										
43	A-3 SERIES		4,815		1,501				1,501		
44	A-4 SERIES		10,294		19,675				19,675		14,207
45	A-6 SERIES (MYP)		230,654		379,220				379,220		226,657
46	EA-6 SERIES		37,036		39,387				39,387		63,371

			COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION								
LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
47	A-7 SERIES		16,764		927				927		10,375
48	AV-8 SERIES		14,219		1,490				1,490		371
49	F-4 SERIES		9,436		4,879				4,879		1,781
50	RF-4 SERIES		1,358		1,394				1,394		626
51	F-14 SERIES		161,458		187,301				187,301		119,696
52	F-8 SERIES		96		95				95		
53	F-5 SERIES		1,614		974				974		2,598
54	OV-10 SERIES		12,033		67,473				67,473		67,731
55	F-18 MODS		15,458		5,865				5,865		5,908
56	H-46 SERIES		138,478		67,919				67,919		54,625
57	H-53 SERIES		33,329		22,641				22,641		46,739
58	SH-60 SERIES		1,569		3,344				3,344		7,331
59	H-1 SERIES		70,105		58,415				58,415		56,043
60	H-2 SERIES		32,498		4,185				4,185		49,465
61	H-3 SERIES		92,786		38,565				38,565		44,322
62	EP-3 SERIES		36,975		47,529				47,529		48,603
63	P-3 SERIES		389,023		38,356				38,356		87.413
64	S-3 SERIES		281,452		215,395				215,395		151,470
65	E-2 SERIES		56,876		41,358				41,358		57,702
66	TRAINER A/C SERIES		5,050		6,745				6,745		5,449
67	TH-57								0		
68	EC-130 SERIES		5,981		16,561				16,561		30,955
69	C-130 SERIES		10,948		6,856				6,856		7,087
70	FEWSG		21,757		17,214				17,214		5,593
71	CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES		6,842		5,094				5,094		5,540
72	VARIOUS		4,611		3,786				3,786		186
73	POWER PLANT CHANGES		8,002		2,742				2,742		11,579
74	MISC FLIGHT SAFETY CHANGES		4,159		947				947		942
75	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT		189,098		97,808				97,808		126,627
76	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES		31,847		21,572				21,572		9,990
	SUBTOTAL, MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT		1,936,621		1,427,213		0		1,427,213		1,320,982

53

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS										
77	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		1,259,111		1,856,145		0		1,856,145		1,745,354
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES										
78	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		605,932		538,603				538,603		620,052
79	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		50,699		32,610				32,610		49,378
80	WAR CONSUMABLES		57,713		34,482				34,482		44,191
81	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		47,961		50,949				50,949		62,563
	SUBTOTAL, AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES		762,305		656,644		0		656,644		776,184
	UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION		---		---		-89,000		-89,000		---
	PRIOR YEAR PROGRAM SAVINGS (FY 86)		---		---		-80,432		-80,432		---
	TOTAL, NAVY AIRCRAFT		11,175,678		11,304,300		752,230		10,552,070		12,397,542

A-6E/F (INTRUDER)

The administration requested $278.9 million for the procurement of 11 A-6E/F Intruder aircraft in fiscal year 1987 and $80.0 million for advance procurement of 12 A-6's in 1988. The A-6E/F is an all-weather, carrier based, medium attack aircraft currently operated by both the Navy and the Marine Corps.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request.

EA-6B (PROWLER) ELECTRONIC COUNTERMEASURES AIRCRAFT

The administration requested $417.7 million for the procurement of 12 EA-6B aircraft in fiscal year 1987 and $22.0 million in advance procurement for 12 aircraft in fiscal year 1988.

The EA-6B is a carrier-based, electronic jamming aircraft designed to protect strike aircraft through electronic countermeasures.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request.

F-14 (TOMCAT) FIGHTER AIRCRAFT

The administration requested $541.1 million for the procurement of 15 F-14 aircraft in fiscal year 1987 and $127.7 million in advance procurement for 12 aircraft in fiscal year 1988.

The F-14 Tomcat is a two-place, variable geometry, fleet defense fighter. Equipped with Phoenix, Sparrow, Sidewinder missiles, and a 20mm cannon, the F-14 is the Navy's primary fleet air defense aircraft.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request.

F/A-18 (HORNET) FIGHTER/ATTACK AIRCRAFT

The administration requested $2,896.4 million for the procurement of 120 F/A-18 aircraft in fiscal year 1987 and $405.9 million in advance procurement funds for 132 aircraft in fiscal year 1988.

The F/A-18 Hornet is a high performance, carrier-based aircraft designed to perform both fighter and attack missions.

The committee recommends disapproval of the administration's request to enter a multiyear obligation for the procurement of F/A-18 aircraft. The multiyear request was based on an increase in aircraft production over the course of the multiyear contract which the committee believes may not be attainable in the current budgetary environment. The committee encourages the administration to submit, for fiscal year 1988, a multiyear request for the F/A-18 aircraft with a minimum production rate of 96 aircraft per year.

The committee recommends authorization of $2,466.4 million for the procurement of 96 F/A-18's in fiscal year 1987 and $305.9 million in advance procurement for fiscal year 1988. The reductions of 24 aircraft and $430.0 million in fiscal year 1987 procurement, and $100.0 million in advance procurement are made without prejudice and are strictly the result of budgetary constraints. The administration is encouraged to submit a request for a minimum of 102 F/A-18's in fiscal year 1988.

AH-1W

The Marine Corps requires an additional 34 aircraft to meet attrition, training and pipeline requirements in the AH-1W attack helicopter fleet. In order to avert production line disruption, the committee authorizes the Department of the Navy to utilize $15.0 million (of the $36.2 million requested in the administration's fiscal year 1987 request) for long lead items required to procure 34 additional AH-1W attack helicopters commencing with fiscal year 1988.

ASW AIRCRAFT

Both the Navy and the committee place a high priority on modernizing the fleet of anti-submarine warfare aircraft. To that end, the committee recommends authorization of the full amount requested for modifications of existing ASW aircraft, together with full authorization of the request for new P-3C patrol aircraft, and SH-60B and SH-60F helicopters.

Last year the committee supported the Navy's then current plan to cease production of the SH-2F LAMPS MK-I helicopter in fiscal year 1986. Consistent with that position, the committee recommends that no funds be authorized for production of SH-2F (LAMPS Mark I) helicopters.

In today's constrained fiscal environment, funding for SH-2F helicopters could only come at the expense of funding for higher priority ASW aircraft.

P-3C AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT

The committee recommends authorization for the Secretary of the Navy to carry out U.S. Navy obligations pursuant to the classified Maritime Surveillance Agreement of 1986. Two of the P-3C Update III aircraft authorized for procurement may be used to implement U.S. Navy obligations under this agreement.

E-2C HAWKEYE

The administration requested $286.5 million for the procurement of 6 E-2C aircraft in fiscal year 1987 and $24.1 million in advance procurement for 6 aircraft in fiscal year 1988.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request.

P-3C MODIFICATIONS

The committee recommends authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to shift up to $120 million, at his discretion, from procurement of new P-3 aircraft to modification of existing P-3 aircraft with Update III equipment. This is identical to a provision included in last year's conference report on the Department of Defense Authorization Act and endorsed by the Secretary of the Navy in testimony before the committee this year.

The rationale for this action remains the same—to introduce competition for funds and thereby reduce the price of P-3 aircraft, to emphasize overall improvements in P-3 capability rather than just acquisition of new aircraft, and to continue support for U.S. long-range air ASW capability.

The Navy may allocate the $120 million between new aircraft and an expanded Update III modification program, in whatever fashion provides the greatest mission benefit. The resulting modification program must be subject to competition.

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

		FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
LINE NO.	PROGRAM	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	BALLISTIC MISSILES										
1	POSEIDON		4,755		3,974				3,974		3,382
2	TRIDENT I		34,444		4,739				4,739		18,344
3	TRIDENT II		294,839	21	1,124,439			21	1,124,439	66	1,913,738
4	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		256,059		300,000				300,000		370,000
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES										
5	UGM-73A (C-3) POSEIDON MODS				95				95		5,178
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES										
6	REPLENISHMENT SPARES								0		
7	MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		4,280		3,790				3,790		2,823
8	ASTRONAUTICS		8,183						0		
	SUBTOTAL, BALLISTIC MISSILES		602,560		1,437,037		0		1,437,037		2,313,465
	OTHER MISSILES										
	STRATEGIC MISSILES										
9	BGM-109 TOMAHAWK	249	670,204	324	721,736		-55,000	324	666,736	410	817,914
10	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		54,600		68,800				68,800		90,185
	TACTICAL MISSILES										
11	AIM/RIM-7 F/M SPARROW	1,948	340,666	1,716	279,394			1,716	279,394	1,594	271,642
12	AMRAAM								0		9,899
13	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)								0		3,000
14	AIM-9L/M SIDEWINDER	2,120	106,956	627	46,977			627	46,977	488	52,178
15	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)				17,641				17,641		
16	AIM-54A/C (PHOENIX)	265	324,026	205	289,272			205	289,272	430	431,777
17	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		24,800		28,400				28,400		9,100
18	AGM-84A HARPOON	370	286,318	94	128,387	16	11,476	110	139,863	204	197,132
19	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)				11,476		-11,476		0		
20	AGM-88A HARM (MYP)	825	224,389	1,110	256,682			1,110	256,682	1,492	336,559

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
21	SM 1 MR		20,300						0		
22	SM 2 MR	846	517,764	844	513,611			844	513,611	850	512,734
23	SM 2 ER	470	319,800	350	217,017			350	217,017	400	234,519
24	RAM			50	63,209	-50	-63,209	0	0	102	78,418
25	STINGER			685	51,940			685	51,940		
26	SIDEARM	200	28,970	256	22,858			256	22,858	256	23,726
27	HELLFIRE	1,304	49,223						0	1,824	62,483
28	LASER MAVERICK	1,500	164,929	1,800	198,791			1,800	198,791	575	72,017
29	IIR MAVERICK	195	26,442	419	52,055			419	52,055	927	91,323
30	PENGUIN								0	35	18,574
31	AERIAL TARGETS		93,152		97,386				97,386		103,965
32	DRONES AND DECOYS		29,085		36,136				36,136		18,169
33	OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT		11,704		22,017				22,017		21,662
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES										
34	TOMAHAWK MODS		2,377		7,235				7,235		8,097
35	AIM/RIM 7E/F SPARROW MOD		2,189		1,233				1,233		3,696
36	AIM 9 SIDEWINDER MOC		19,274		3,131				3,131		3,295
37	AIM 54A/C PHOENIX MOD		9,627						0		3,388
38	AGM 84A HARPOON MOD		9,040						0		11,416
39	STANDARD MISSILES MOD		17,096		2,093				2,093		7,722
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES										
40	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS								0		
41	WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		23,683		7,490		5,175		12,665		10,259
42	FLEET SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS		53,056		65,138		-3,000		62,138	1	118,297
43	DEFENSE METEOROLOGICAL SATELLITE PROGRAM								0		18,793
	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
44	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		26,189		132,958				132,958		356,626
	SUBTOTAL, OTHER MISSILES		3,455,859		3,343,063		-116,034		3,227,029		3,998,565
	TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT										
45	MK-48								0		
46	TORPEDO MK-48 ADCAP	123	395,927	227	508,370			227	508,370	296	552,562
47	ASUW TORPEDO			34	16,995			34	16,995	110	30,851

		FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
LINE NO.	PROGRAM	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
48	TORPEDO MK-46 (MYP)	500	95,333	500	74,061			500	74,061	500	87,746
49	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		23,600		23,800				23,800		
50	ADV LIGHTWEIGHT TORPEDO			84	109,937			84	109,937	204	346,880
51	MK-60 CAPTOR	150	56,595						0		
52	MOBILE TARGET MK-30 (MYP)	6	17,685						0	12	39,431
53	MK-38 MINI MOBILE TARGET	1,200	3,232						0		
54	ASROC		14,026		13,597				13,597		13,672
55	VERTICAL LAUNCHED ASROC			200	74,289			200	74,289	300	73,542
	MOD OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP										
56	MOBILE MINE MK-67		3,639						0		
57	TORPEDO MK-46 MODS	672	81,032	672	76,975			672	76,975	319	49,275
58	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		8,400		5,200				5,200		
59	CAPTOR MODS		14,933		11,619				11,619		12,301
60	SWIMMER WEAPON SYSTEM		1,501		3,911				3,911		1,474
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
61	TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		44,810		32,496				32,496		36,092
62	ASW RANGE SUPPORT		22,019		20,114				20,114		23,170
63	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS								0		
	SUBTOTAL, TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT		782,732		971,364		0		971,364		1,266,996
	OTHER WEAPONS										
	GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS										
64	MK-15 CLOSE IN WEAPONS SYSTEM	39	139,304	27	105,606			27	105,606	9	43,065
65	MK-75 76MM GUN MOUNT	6	16,988	5	14,875			5	14,875		
66	MK-19/40MM MACHINE GUN	56	1,137	25	632			25	632	25	635
67	25MM GUN MOUNT	29	5,092	22	3,919			22	3,919	22	4,247
68	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS		10,749		10,082				10,082		10,697
	MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS										
69	CIWS MODS		29,933		42,965				42,965		54,706
70	5"/54 GUN MOUNT MODS		12,933		6,128				6,128		10,656
71	3"/50 GUN MOUNT MODS		637		1,637				1,637		239
72	MK 75 76MM GUN MOUNT MODS		3,792		4,101				4,101		5,730
73	MODS UNDER $900,000		1,782		2,384				2,384		1,719

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
74	GUN SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		1,100		873				873		706
75	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS								0		
	SUBTOTAL, OTHER WEAPONS		223,447		193,202		0		193,202		132,400
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS										
76	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		151,497		150,734		0		150,734		162,056
	UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION		---		---		-73,476		-73,476		
	TOTAL, NAVY WEAPONS		5,216,095		6,095,400		-189,510		5,905,890		7,873,482

TRIDENT II

The administration requested $1,124.4 million for the procurement of 21 Trident II (D-5) sea-launched ballistic missiles, and $300.0 million for advanced procurement of future missiles. In addition, $1,632.9 million was requested for continued research and development on the missile in fiscal year 1987. The Trident II missile will make a significant contribution to deterrence by providing U.S. planners with a survivable capability to hold at risk the full range of Soviet military targets.

The administration's request for Trident II supports the continuation of full scale engineering development, including the start of flight testing during fiscal year 1987. The request also initiates the procurement of Trident II missiles, which is required to support the initial operational capability (IOC) of December 1989.

The committee notes that due to budgetary constraints imposed during the formulation of the fiscal year 1987 request, there is more risk in the Trident II program than was the case last year. This is so because the number of missiles to be procured in fiscal year 1987 has been reduced relative to estimates provided to the committee last year. This adds schedule risk to the initial submarine outload. In addition, the procurement for certain components on a "production continuity" or "life of type" basis, which enhances system reliability, has been deleted. The Navy is encouraged to take all possible steps, within available funding, to minimize schedule risk, and to reconsider "production continuity" or "life of type" procurements for those components that are most critical to system reliability.

In view of the importance that the committee attaches to the earliest deployment of a counterforce capable ballistic missile at sea, the committee recommends full funding of the Trident II program. In addition, Trident II related RDT&E and Other Procurement funding should not be subjected to undistributed reductions allocated against those accounts. Bill language is recommended to insure that funds authorized to be appropriated for the Trident II program are spent only for that purpose.

TOMAHAWK

The administration requested $721.7 million for the procurement of 324 Tomahawk sea-launched cruise missiles, $68.8 million for advanced procurement of future missiles, and $68.4 million for associated research and development in fiscal year 1987. With its nuclear and conventional land-attack, and conventional anti-ship variants, the Tomahawk sea-launched cruise missile provides a variety of naval platforms with a capability to strike enemy targets at long ranges.

The request for 324 sea-launched cruise missiles (SLCMs), in combination with the Air Force's request for 76 ground-launched cruise missiles (GLCMs), comprise the minimum production quantities required to support the ongoing dual source procurement. In view of the economic savings and quality assurance that result from this competitive approach, the committee continues to strongly support dual source procurement.

The committee recommends authorization of the production quantities requested. However, in view of budgetary considerations and estimates of anticipated contract savings based on favorable negotiations in fiscal year 1986, the committee recommends a reduction of $55.0 million in the request for procurement funding. The committee recommends authorization of the full amount requested for advanced procurement and research and development.

AIM-7M SPARROW

The administration requested $279.4 million for the procurement of 1,716 AIM-7M Sparrow missiles for the Navy in fiscal year 1987.

The AIM-7M Sparrow missile is a joint Navy/Air Force, medium range, air-to-air, radar guided missile. Inventory shortfalls of air-to-air missiles, particularly the radar guided Sparrow, have been identified by operational commanders (CINC's) as one of the most significant deficiencies in their warfighting posture.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request for Sparrow missiles.

AIM-9M SIDEWINDER

The administration requested $47.0 million for the procurement of 627 AIM-9M Sidewinder missiles for the Navy in fiscal year 1987 and $17.6 million for advance procurement in fiscal year 1988.

The AIM-9M Sidewinder is a joint Navy/Air Force short-range, air-to-air missile with heat seeking (infra-red) guidance. The AIM-9M is the newest version of this very successful air-to-air missile.

The committee recommends authorization of the administration's request for the procurement of Sidewinder missiles.

AIM-54C PHOENIX MISSILE

The administration requested $289.3 million for the procurement of 205 AIM-54C Phoenix missiles in fiscal year 1987 and $28.4 million in advance procurement funds for fiscal year 1988.

The AIM-54C Phoenix is a supersonic, all weather, long-range air-to-air missile with semi-active midcourse guidance and an active terminal seeker. The AIM-54C incorporates advanced digital electronics and an improved target detector designed to enhance current operational capabilities.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request for Phoenix missiles.

AGM-84 HARPOON

The administration requested $128.4 million for the procurement of 94 AGM-84 Harpoon missiles in fiscal year 1987 and $11.5 million in advance procurement funds for 1988.

The AGM-84 Harpoon is an air, surface, and submarine-launched anti-ship missile. The Harpoon is presently planned for use aboard the P-3, S-3, A-6, and F/A-18 aircraft as well as several surface combatants.

The committee recommends authorization of $139.9 million for the procurement of 110 AGM-84 Harpoon missiles in 1987 and no funds for advance procurement in 1988. The advance procurement funds were requested to provide a production surge capability for Harpoon. The committee believes this capability would be nice to have but is not essential in this budgetary environment and recommends instead that these funds be used to increase current missile production.

ROLLING AIRFRAME MISSILE

The committee recommends that production funds not be authorized for the Navy's Rolling Airframe Missile program. This issue is addressed further in the RDT&E section of this report.

WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES

The administration requested $7.5 million for weapons industrial facilities for the Navy. The committee recommends an increase of $5.175 million, for a total of $12.675 million. The additional funds are to be used to continue the restoration of damaged facilities at the Allegheny Ballistics Laboratory. Allegheny Ballistics Laboratory is a government-owned, contractor-operated facility in West Virginia that produces rocket motors for Navy air-to-air missiles. Four facilities recently destroyed by an accidental explosion and fire must be reconstructed. The funds are sufficient to construct a new cure bay complex, magazine, rocket motor disassembly building and a munitions assembly building.

SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS

The administration requested $10.1 million for the procurement of small arms and weapons in fiscal year 1987. The request was fully funded and no undistributed reduction shall apply to this authorization.

UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION

The committee recommends an undistributed reduction of $73.5 million against the Navy's Weapons Procurement account. This reduction is made to comply with budget limitations.

The committee is pleased that competitive procurement and efficient production rates have been yielding substantial savings in the weapons procurement account. Where appropriate, those savings should be used to buy additional weapons. In that regard, the committee intends that the numbers of weapons authorized in fiscal year 1987 be regarded as minimum quantities. When circumstances permit, additional weapons should be procured within the funding authorized.

CONSOLIDATION OF MUNITIONS

Last year, the committee observed that the presentation of funding for munitions in the Navy's budget is not consistent and should be changed. Specifically, expendable ordnance (including gun ammunition, sonobuoys, and mines) and countermeasures now funded in the Other Procurement, Navy account should instead be funded in the Weapons Procurement, Navy account.

Since the Navy's presentation of its funding request for ordnance did not change, the committee has included language in the bill requiring that all funding for Navy ordnance and munitions be included in a single account.

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

						COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION					
		FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION	
LINE NO.	PROGRAM	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	NEW CONSTRUCTION SHIPS										
1	TRIDENT (NUCLEAR)	1	1,151,300	1	1,362,700			1	1,362,700	1	1,362,800
2	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		150,100		146,400				146,400		153,700
3	SSN-688 CLASS SUBMARINE (NUCLEAR)	4	2,054,500	4	2,047,800			4	2,047,800	3	1,612,800
4	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		486,400		284,800				284,800		434,100
5	SSN-21				454,300				454,300		160,200
9	CG-47 AEGIS CRUISER (MYP)	3	2,597,700	2	1,913,800			2	1,913,800	2	1,888,000
10	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		14,600		10,500				10,500		14,600
11	DDG-51 (MYP)			3	2,448,000		18,000	3	2,466,000	3	2,278,150
12	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		74,000		79,800				79,800		76,400
13	LSD-41 LANDING SHIP DOCK (CY)	2	373,400						0		
15	LHD-1 AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT SHIP (MYP)	1	1,102,700						0	1	873,000
16	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		165,600		232,000				232,000		173,900
19	MCM MINE COUNTERMEASURES SHIP	2	197,200						0	3	272,200
20	MSH-1 COASTAL MINE HUNTER	4	184,500	4	196,100	-4	-196,100	0	0	4	181,800
21	TAO FLEET OILER	2	266,300	2	275,500			2	275,500	2	319,900
23	TAGOS SURTASS SHIPS	2	113,900	3	148,100			3	148,100	3	193,900
24	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		1,200						0		
26	AOE			1	612,700	-1	-612,700	0	0		
28	OCEANOGRAPHIC RESEARCH SHIP			1	33,000			1	33,000		
	CONVERSIONS										
6	BATTLESHIP REACT	1	469,000						0		
7	CV SLEP								0	1	529,200
8	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		52,000		83,500				83,500		15,600
17	LPD-4 SLEP				23,100		-23,100		0		97,800
18	LSD-41 (CARGO VARIANT)								0	1	311,200
22	AO (JUMBO)			1	62,300			1	62,300	1	49,500

66

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
25	AE AMMUNITION SHIP								0	1	369,000
27	AG SOUND BARGE	1	57,000						0		
29	MOORED TRNG SHIP DEMO (CURRENT YEAR (A/P		175,400						0		
42	TACS CRANE SHIP	3	82,500	2	61,100			2	61,100	2	59,900
43	TAVB AVN SUP SHIP	1	26,900						0		
	OTHER SCN										
---	MSH-X MINESWEEPER HUNTER					2	0	2	0		---
32	SERVICE CRAFT		62,700		39,900				39,900		30,200
33	LANDING CRAFT				19,000				19,000		60,500
34	STRATEGIC SEALIFT		228,400		27,000				27,000		50,400
35	LCAC LANDING CRAFT	12	276,200						0	9	204,300
36	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		30,800						0		17,000
37	SEALIFT ENHANCEMENT				20,700				20,700		18,400
38	OUTFITTING		228,500		226,100				226,100		296,300
39	POST DELIVERY		112,600		167,800				167,800		137,600
40	SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN				69,400		10,000		79,400		62,700
41	COST GROWTH		97,000						0		
	PRICE ADJUSTMENTS (FY 87)		---		---		-139,100		-139,100		---
	PRIOR YEAR PROGRAM SAVINGS (FY 86)		---		---		-188,600		-188,600		---
	TOTAL, NAVY SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION		10,840,400		11,046,200		-1,131,600		9,914,600		12,295,850

OVERVIEW

The administration requested $11,046.2 million for the Navy shipbuilding and conversion (SCN) program for fiscal year 1987. This would fund 24 ships, of which 20 are new construction and 4 are conversions. The specific ships are listed in the table.

The committee recommends authorization of $9,914.6 million for Navy shipbuilding and conversion, a reduction of $1,131.6 million (10%) from the request.

The committee recommendation does not include funding for one major ship in the request, the first of a new class of AOE multiproduct auxiliary ships.

This recommendation is made to comply with budget constraints and results from an overall assessment of shipbuilding needs and warfighting priorities.

SSN-21 NEW DESIGN SUBMARINE

The committee recommends authorization of long lead funds for the first SSN-21 class nuclear-powered attack submarine.

The committee reviewed the SSN-21 program and held one hearing dedicated to this subject. Improvements in the Soviet submarine force are significant and will continue, while physical constraints limit further improvements to the LOS ANGELES (SSN-688) class design. Accordingly, the committee recognizes the pressing need for a new design submarine and fully supports the SSN-21 program.

DDG-51 HELICOPTER SUPPORT FACILITIES

Last year's conference report on the Department of Defense Authorization Act directed the Secretary of the Navy to review and report on options for expanding helicopter support facilities in some or all ARLEIGH BURKE (DDG-51) class destroyers.

Based on the Secretary of the Navy's report, the committee recommends that DDG-52 and subsequent ships of the ARLEIGH BURKE class be provided with the RAST landing system and facilities for refueling and rearming helicopters with both torpedoes and sonobuoys. For less than 1% of the ship's total cost, these additional features will substantially increase the combat effectiveness of the entire ASW helicopter force.

The committee recommends authorization of $10 million for ship design work and $18 million in the DDG-51 line to add helicopter support facilities to the three ARLEIGH BURKE class destroyers authorized in fiscal year 1987. The Navy should also plan to include this capability in all future ships of this class.

The committee does not recommend this capability be incorporated in the lead ship during her initial construction, since that ship is already under a fixed-price contract.

MINESWEEPER HUNTER

Because of design deficiencies and critical shock test failures, the committee recommends that no fiscal year 1987 funds be authorized to procure additional ships of the MSH-1 class.

At the same time, the committee is very concerned about serious shortcomings in this nation's mine countermeasures capability. Despite good faith efforts over several years to redress this deficiency, little progress has been made. Given the urgency of this situation, the committee now believes that unusual corrective measures are warranted.

Rather than design a wholly new ship, with all the delay and risk that course would entail, the committee recommends the Secretary of the Navy be authorized to use up to $100 million in unobligated prior year funds from the MSH program to acquire a European design capable of meeting our MSH mission. This initiative would add near-term minehunting capability to our fleet at a well defined cost and low risk.

The committee expects that follow-on ships of whatever design the Secretary selects will be built in quantity in the United States. To this end, the committee has recommended bill language authorizing use of prior year funds to acquire a lead ship or parts thereof for completion in the United States. One additional partially outfitted hull may also be procured to facilitate transfer of the manufacturing technology to U.S. shipbuilders.

The committee recognizes the customary prohibition on funding the construction of ships abroad and grants a one time exception for the lead ship and one partial follow hull so that a rapid build up of MSH force levels can be achieved.

Further discussion of the MSH-X minesweeper hunter program is included in the discussion on NATO cooperation within the general provisions section.

PRIOR YEAR SAVINGS

The committee has identified $188.6 million in prior year savings which may be used to fund Navy shipbuilding programs in fiscal year 1987. These fiscal year 1986 savings include: $181.5 million from the SSN-688 program; $184.5 million from the MSH-1 program; $0.9 million from the TAO program; $3.0 million from the service craft (YTT) program; and $57.0 million from the T-AG program. This total is reduced by $137.8 to comply with Gramm-Rudman-Hollings requirements. An additional allowance of $100 million remains to fund the MSH-X minesweeper hunter program.

FORMAT OF ACCOUNT

The table which displays the budget for Navy shipbuilding and conversion (SCN) does not follow the same format as the budget submission. This format, which groups programs into three categories—new construction, conversions, and other—is more convenient for the committee's use.

The committee requests the Secretary of Defense use this revised format when presenting the budget request next year.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	SHIPS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
	SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT										
1	LM 2500 GAS TURBINE		13,335		22,351				22,351		16,550
2	ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE	2	15,534	2	14,740			2	14,740	2	13,831
3	LM2500 SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		940		967				967		997
4	STEAM PROPULSION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM		6,805		11,766				11,766		12,135
5	OTHER PROPULSION EQUIPMENT		18,533		27,249				27,249		15,087
	GENERATORS										
6	OTHER GENERATORS		15,368		14,946				14,946		13,891
	PUMPS										
7	OTHER PUMPS		11,073		18,538				18,538		9,937
	AIR COMPRESSORS										
8	HIGH PRESSURE AIR COMPRESSOR	12	3,241	28	7,048			28	7,048	24	5,560
9	OTHER AIR COMPRESSORS			8	1,461			8	1,461	2	426
	PROPELLERS										
10	SUBMARINE PROPELLERS	15	2,976	17	2,157			17	2,157	18	3,866
11	OTHER PROPELLERS AND SHAFTS		10,545		9,557				9,557		10,604
	NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT										
12	ELECTRICALLY SUSPENDED GYRO NAVIGATOR	8	34,869	13	34,510			13	34,510	8	29,630
13	CARRIER NAVIGATION SYSTEM		6,266		3,433				3,433		5,302
14	OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT		13,428		8,850				8,850		6,657
	UNDERWAY REPLENISH EQUIP										
15	UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT		8,457		2,959				2,959		4,594
	PERISCOPES										
16	TYPE 18 PERISCOPE		14,825		21,325				21,325		4,750
17	TYPE 8 PERISCOPES		120		282				282		8,994
18	PERISCOPES AND ACCESSORIES		4,908		5,603				5,603		15,386
	OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT										
19	FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT		5,013		11,848				11,848		13,003

		FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
LINE NO.	PROGRAM	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
20	COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARDS	10	10,585	5	2,799			5	2,799	15	4,954
21	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT		9,246		8,471				8,471		7,855
22	SUBMARINE SILENCING EQUIPMENT		18,032		27,084				27,084		14,215
23	SURFACE SHIP SILENCING EQUIPMENT		1,379		8,975				8,975		11,685
24	SUBMARINE BATTERIES	43	8,227	53	12,200			53	12,200	58	13,978
25	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		53,755		72,778				72,778		120,668
26	DSSP EQUIPMENT		11,262		9,797				9,797		14,400
27	SEALIFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		63,752		58,277				58,277		37,155
28	AIR CONDITIONERS								0		2,155
29	MINESWEEPING CABLE		5,019		7,350				7,350		8,559
30	HM+E ITEMS UNDER 900K		10,690		28,661				28,661		32,654
31	SURFACE IMA		6,970		21,877				21,877		25,722
32	DEGAUSSING EQUIPMENT								0		1,389
33	RADIOLOGICAL CONTROLS		2,201		227				227		347
34	MINI/MICROMINI ELECTRONIC REPAIR		1,028		1,001				1,001		1,026
35	CHEMICAL WARFARE DETECTORS	314	15,386	214	10,940			214	10,940	297	14,466
36	SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM	4	6,529	15	27,892			15	27,892	10	21,549
37	HM&E ENGINEERED MAINTENANCE		8,407		4,067				4,067		4,123
38	SHIPBOARD ENERGY CONSERVATION								0		926
	REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT										
39	REACTOR POWER UNITS	6	163,368	6	202,502			6	202,502	8	290,490
40	REACTOR COMPONENTS		227,754		227,883				227,883		236,154
	OCEAN ENGINEERING										
41	DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT		8,250		11,855				11,855		16,870
42	NAVAL SPECIAL WARFARE EQUIPMENT		37,401		31,707				31,707		33,895
	SMALL BOATS										
43	SMALL BOATS	251	14,777	340	19,570			340	19,570	141	17,011
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT										
44	NEW SHIP TRAINING EQUIP		19,572		12,547				12,547		
45	OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT		10,876		6,075				6,075		4,268
	PRODUCTION FACILITIES EQUIPMENT										
46	CALIBRATION EQUIPMENT		1,052		1,590				1,590		1,173
47	PRODUCTION SUPPORT FACILITIES		5,794		13,737				13,737		19,412
48	OPERATING FORCES IPE				4,914				4,914		10,717

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL QTY	FY 86 FINAL AMOUNT	FY 87 REQUEST QTY	FY 87 REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: RECOMMENDATION QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT	FY 88 PROJECTION QTY	FY 88 PROJECTION AMOUNT
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS										
49	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS								0		
	SUBTOTAL, SHIPS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		907,548		1,054,366		0		1,054,366		1,159,016
	COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT										
	SHIP RADARS										
50	AN/SPS-67	23	9,207	17	7,209			17	7,209	8	3,955
51	AN/SPS-40		14,776		17,732				17,732		29,876
52	AN/SPS-48		67,443		48,800				48,800		59,645
53	AN/SPS-49		14,127		17,012				17,012		27,317
54	AN/SYS-( )	6	12,327	4	13,725			4	13,725	6	14,612
55	MK 23 TARGET ACQUISITION SYSTEM	2	13,148	12	20,080			12	20,080	3	19,138
56	RADAR SUPPORT		24,989		13,869				13,869		11,475
	SHIP SONARS										
57	AN/SQS-26/53/53A		7,319		14,222				14,222		12,823
58	AN/SQS-53B	5	30,446	4	25,086			4	25,086	10	63,996
59	AN/SQS-53C			1	34,001			1	34,001	1	20,371
60	AN/BQQ-5		99,345		83,327				83,327		28,691
61	TB-16 TOWED ARRAY (MYP)	9	1,515	18	4,610			18	4,610	16	6,911
62	SURF SONAR WINDOWS AND DOMES		8,384		10,378				10,378		7,275
63	SONAR SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		11,706		10,430				10,430		12,304
64	SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS		39,307		36,470				36,470		48,813
65	FBM SYSTEM SONARS		19,512		1,787				1,787		10,312
	ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT										
66	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEMS		10,241		23,231				23,231		40,409
67	AN/SLQ-25 (NIXIE)	44	11,365	27	9,359			27	9,359	18	45,456
68	ACOUSTIC COMMUNICATIONS		376		655				655		1,221
69	SUBMARINE ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEM		49		46,228				46,228		44,322
70	SOSUS		85,156		83,183				83,183		83,872
71	AN/SQR-17 ACOUSTIC PROCESSOR	23	21,998	20	7,829			20	7,829	6	5,094
72	AN/SQR-18 TOWED ARRAY SONAR		40,967		28,721				28,721		37,871
73	AN/SQR-15 TOWED ARRAY SONAR		1,880		1,197				1,197		827
74	AN/SQR-19 TOWED ARRAY SONAR	17	139,010	10	112,414			10	112,414	10	100,202

						COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION					
LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
75	SURTASS		15,564		19,750				19,750		21,499
76	ASW OPERATIONS CENTER		23,328		12,723				12,723		3,931
77	CARRIER ASW MODULE		31,016		27,894				27,894		18,010
	ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT										
78	AN/SLQ-32		97,319		75,993				75,993		97,770
79	AN/SLQ-17	2	14,229	5	14,197			5	14,197	6	30,829
80	AN/WLR-1		3,533		4,269				4,269		5,478
81	AN/WLR-8	1	3,011						0		
82	ICAD SYSTEMS		4,822						0		5,473
83	OFFBOARD DECEPTION DEVICES		18,122		22,554				22,554		49,217
84	EW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		21,290		10,240				10,240		11,208
85	FLEET EW SUPPORT GROUP		1,716		1,648				1,648		1,437
86	C3 COUNTERMEASURES		637		69,155				69,155		67,337
	RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT										
87	COMBAT CRYPTOLOGIC SUPPORT CONSOLE		4,012		5,203				5,203		9,694
88	COMBAT DF		25,071		36,665				36,665		58,952
89	OUTBOARD		36,381		26,063				26,063		32,529
90	NAVAL INTELLIGENCE PROCESSING SYSTEM		15,460		9,595				9,595		10,578
91	BATTLE GROUP PASSIVE HORIZON EXT SYS								0		46,371
	SUBMARINE SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT										
92	AN/WLQ-4 DEPOT		5,441		1,170				1,170		8,980
93	AN/WLQ-4 IMPROVEMENTS		2,452		3,582				3,582		21,908
94	AN/BRD-7/8/9								0	13	37,676
95	AN/BQH-5 (TUBA)								0		
96	AN/BLD-1 (INTERFEROMETER)	5	11,800						0	7	14,452
97	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROGRAM		4,000		4,911				4,911		3,461
	OTHER SHIP ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT										
98	NAVY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM		130,321		104,681				104,681		120,286
99	TACTICAL FLAG COMMAND CENTER	4	20,768	3	17,237			3	17,237	3	18,051
100	COMMAND AND CONTROL PROCESSOR			4	3,939			4	3,939	19	18,602
101	MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT		3,054		2,149				2,149		6,531
102	OMEGA SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT	44	1,619						0	119	4,184
103	NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS	62	20,763	135	24,915			135	24,915	173	15,959
104	HF LINK-11 DATA TERMINALS	13	3,570	18	4,324			18	4,324	7	6,170

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL QTY	FY 86 FINAL AMOUNT	FY 87 REQUEST QTY	FY 87 REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: RECOMMENDATION QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT	FY 88 PROJECTION QTY	FY 88 PROJECTION AMOUNT
105	ARMED FORCES RADIO AND TV		6,943		5,127				5,127		6,465
106	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		107,519		161,346				161,346		126,822
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT										
107	OTHER NAVELEX TRAINING EQUIPMENT		132						0		685
108	OTHER NAVSEA TRAINING EQUIPMENT		3,803		5,035				5,035		1,957
	AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT										
109	MATCALS		6,661		29,556				29,556		32,392
110	TERPES								0		
111	SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL		13,330		12,914				12,914		16,715
112	AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEMS				23,092				23,092		21,291
113	TACAN		4,831		873				873		6,646
114	AIR STATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		11,479		15,054				15,054		12,928
115	MICROWAVE LANDING SYSTEM			12	6,146			12	6,146	14	6,985
116	FACSFAC		16,925		22,098				22,098		26,015
117	RADAR AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	15	1,494	15	1,521			15	1,521	16	1,566
118	MK XII AIMS IFF		2,737		9,422				9,422		10,339
	OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT										
119	NAVAL SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM				3,053				3,053		9,135
120	SPACE SYSTEM PROCESSING		2,133		2,166				2,166		2,155
121	MULTOTS		565		1,242				1,242		
122	NCCS ASHORE		34,978		39,604				39,604		25,364
123	RADIAC		8,582		7,931				7,931		7,859
124	OVER THE HORIZON RADAR				2,270				2,270		165,037
125	REMOTE SENSORS		1,578						0		
126	GPETE		28,640		28,326				28,326		22,580
127	INTEG COMBAT SYS TEST FACILITY		5,000		4,806				4,806		6,289
128	CALIBRATION STANDARDS		6,965		8,216				8,216		9,465
129	EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION		9,387		7,369				7,369		9,302
130	SHORE ELEC ITEMS UNDER $900K		8,874		8,718				8,718		5,165
	SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS										
131	SHIPBOARD HF COMMUNICATIONS		4,982		11,737				11,737		10,161
132	SHIPBOARD UHF COMMUNICATIONS		7,283		9,445				9,445		9,411
133	FLIGHT DECK COMMUNICATIONS		5,812		1,991				1,991		10,280
134	PORTABLE RADIOS	271	3,693	674	8,282			674	8,282	618	4,009

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL QTY	FY 86 FINAL AMOUNT	FY 87 REQUEST QTY	FY 87 REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION RECOMMENDATION QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT	FY 88 PROJECTION QTY	FY 88 PROJECTION AMOUNT
135	SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION		15,787		17,950				17,950		10,894
136	SHIP COMM ITEMS UNDER $900K		9,206		13,486				13,486		15,601
137	SEALIFT SHIP COMM		4,820		4,716				4,716		4,648
	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS										
138	ELF COMMUNICATIONS	34	13,223	77	30,836			77	30,836		
139	SHORE LF/VLF COMMUNICATIONS		15,867		17,781				17,781		18,810
140	VERDIN		16,096		11,824				11,824		7,529
141	SSN INTEGRATED COMMUNICATIONS		1,679		2,237				2,237		1,622
142	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION ANTENNAS		15,435		27,925				27,925		28,802
143	DATA COLLECTION AND RECORD SYS	25	979	25	943			25	943		
144	COMPACT VLF RECEIVER								0	90	27,621
145	CIRCUIT MAYFLOWER		254						0		
	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS										
146	SATCOM SHIP TERMINALS		45,996		34,544				34,544		30,767
147	SATCOM SHORE TERMINALS		22,754		8,979				8,979		25,616
	SHORE COMMUNICATIONS										
148	JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT		2,073		6,739				6,739		7,145
149	ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS		132		1,523				1,523		1,244
150	SHORE HF COMMUNICATIONS		29,595		11,334				11,334		14,774
151	JOINT TACTICAL COMM (TRI TAC)		26,713		33,872				33,872		35,517
152	DCS TECH CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS				98				98		981
153	VOICE FREQ CARRIER TELEGRAPH				49				49		2,029
154	ASHORE MOBILE COMM VANS	2	6,031		6				6		
155	WORLDWIDE WIDEBAND COMM		2,088		3,655				3,655		3,251
156	DEFENCE DATA NETWORK		2,783						0		
157	WWMCCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT		1,099		406				406		542
158	SHORE COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION		9,892		9,700				9,700		14,805
159	SHORE COMM ITEMS UNDER $900K		3,146		2,054				2,054		3,472
	CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT										
160	SINGLE AUDIO SYSTEM		18,153		16,965				16,965		15,324
161	TSEC/KY 71/72 (STU II/STU III)		3,114		13,572				13,572		29,869
162	TSEC/KG 84		27,080		27,871				27,871		33,477
163	TSEC/KY 57/58 (VINSON)		25,017		20,397				20,397		30,166
164	TSEC/KYV 5 (ANDVT)		4,629		6,333				6,333		5,585

		FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
LINE NO.	PROGRAM	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
165	TSEC/KW 46		14,283		8,797				8,797		
166	TSEC/KG 72/KGV-14 (FDCS)	6	1,363						0		
167	TSEC/KG 81 (WALBURN)		5,251		1,188				1,188		1,393
168	TSEC/KG 44 (DMSP)	123	7,893		5,013				5,013		5,013
169	TSEC/KGR 96 (ITSS)			21	2,518			21	2,518		
170	TSEC/KG-58/KGV 6 (PLRS)		9,483						0		7,877
171	TRITAC CRYPTO		11,928		28,414				28,414		34,486
172	TSEC/KY 67 (BANCROFT)	1,615	13,474						0		
173	TSEC/KGV 11	136	4,455	632	14,784			632	14,784		15,438
174	COMMON FILL DEVICES		1,997		479				479		476
175	SIGNAL SECURITY		1,891		362				362		377
176	CRYPTOGRAPHIC ITEMS UNDER $900K		5,500		12,221				12,221		15,451
177	TSEC/KGV 8								0		134
	CRYPTOLOGIC EQUIPMENT										
178	CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP		4,335		810				810		2,048
179	SHIPS SIGNAL EXPLOITATION SPACE		3,625		1,625				1,625		9,674
180	CRYPTOLOGIC ITEMS UNDER $900K		6,016		5,613				5,613		7,673
181	CRYPTOLOGIC RESERVES EQUIPMENT		824		1,172				1,172		2,138
182	CRYPTOLOGIC FIELD TRAINING EQUIP		2,065		768				768		952
183	SHORE CRYPTOLOGIC SUPPORT SYSTEM		2,273		2,020				2,020		2,019
	OTHER ELECTRONIC SUPPORT										
184	WAR RESERVE		76		1,013				1,013		
185	ELEC ENGINEERED MAINT (NAVSEA)		5,339		5,153				5,153		3,259
186	ELEC ENGINEERED MAINT (NAVELEX)		2,128		1,933				1,933		1,993
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS										
187	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS								0		
	SUBTOTAL, COMMUNICATIONS & ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT		2,016,065		2,031,430		0		2,031,430		2,529,871
	AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
	SONOBUOYS										
188	AN/SSQ-36 (BT)	31,600	2,300	32,536	4,728			32,536	4,728	30,135	4,631
189	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)								0		
190	AN/SSQ-53 (DIFAR)	415,000	141,952	273,615	100,583			273,615	100,583	180,490	79,370

						COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION					
LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
191	AN/SSQ-57 (SPECIAL PURPOSE)	30,575	5,570	11,935	2,881			11,935	2,881	13,083	3,190
192	AN/SSQ-62 (DICASS)	20,900	26,731	27,436	35,265			27,436	35,265	13,236	21,254
193	AN/SSQ-75 (ERAPS)								0	435	14,372
194	AN/SSQ-77 (VLAD)	95,000	81,474	95,800	61,388			95,800	61,388	81,200	70,349
195	AN/SSQ-71 (ATAC)								0	2,026	
196	AN/SSQ-86 (DLC)	1,875	2,994	1,860	2,840			1,860	2,840	700	1,633
197	SIGNAL UNDERWATER SOUND (SUS)	5,376	1,351	4,500	1,228			4,500	1,228	4,649	1,304
198	SONOBUOY SPECIAL TEST EQUIPMENT								0		
199	LOW COST SONOBOUY	200,000	45,445	490,000	26,569			490,000	26,569	490,000	26,689
	AIR LAUNCHED ORDNANCE										
200	SKIPPER	1,004	27,616	1,600	44,706			1,600	44,706	2,556	83,261
201	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		144,217		126,929				126,929		153,116
202	LASER GUIDED BOMB KITS	2,552	27,150	515	6,344			515	6,344	642	8,311
203	WALLEYE		38,352		35,293				35,293		39,873
204	ROCKEYE	1,388	8,829	1,528	8,875			1,528	8,875	1,533	8,656
205	ZUNI ROCKET		47,370		26,271				26,271		27,817
206	2.75 INCH ROCKET		58,934		31,416				31,416		21,403
207	PARACHUTE FLARES	1,004	4,357	302	1,947			302	1,947	139	1,061
208	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION		13,841		21,180				21,180		26,463
209	PRACTICE BOMBS		57,392		30,678				30,678		52,458
210	CARTRIDGES + CARTRIDGE ACTUATED DEVICES		37,212		25,253				25,253		18,592
211	AIRCRAFT ESCAPE ROCKETS		8,055		7,458				7,458		8,844
212	AIRBORNE EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES		67,608		40,852				40,852		79,816
213	MARINE LOCATION MARKERS		6,656		8,307				8,307		8,163
214	DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY MATERIAL		2,186		2,454				2,454		2,327
215	BIGEYE CHEMICAL WEAPON			585	28,533			585	28,533	1,053	48,489
216	JATOS		2,894		2,621				2,621		8,915
217	GATOR			912	42,585			912	42,585	1,371	34,385
218	MISC AIR LAUNCHED ORDNANCE		176		566				566		4,840
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
219	WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		89,983		46,431				46,431		61,615
220	EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS		2,057		1,292				1,292		5,247
221	AIRCRAFT REARMING EQUIPMENT		54,730		38,830				38,830		51,637
222	CATAPULTS AND ARRESTING GEAR		23,803		33,670				33,670		42,322

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
223	AIRFIELD ARRESTING GEAR								0		
224	METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT		2,331		19,015				19,015		30,669
225	OTHER PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT		7,331		2,078				2,078		1,815
226	MISC SURVIVAL EQUIPMENT		16,805		17,603				17,603		16,666
227	AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES		27,094		32,304				32,304		31,573
228	LAMPS MK III SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT		49,893		34,993				34,993		41,663
229	REWSON PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT		2,250		1,858				1,858		2,359
230	STOCK SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT		2,256		1,971				1,971		3,292
231	OTHER AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		2,233		5,719				5,719		3,166
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS										
232	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS								0		
	SUBTOTAL, AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		1,141,428		963,514		0		963,514		1,143,586
	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
	SHIP GUN AMMUNITION										
233	3 /50 GUN AMMUNITION				3,743				3,743		5,287
234	5 /38 GUN AMMUNITION		4,461		6,309				6,309		7,781
235	5 /54 GUN AMMUNITION		46,763		75,825				75,825		77,127
236	5 INCH GUIDED PROJECTILE		104,192		127,916				127,916		101,615
237	16 INCH GUN AMMUNITION		7,081		7,667				7,667		10,751
238	CIWS AMMUNITION		31,203		41,814				41,814		49,487
239	76MM GUN AMMUNITION		10,023		17,092				17,092		5,332
240	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION		15,369		25,990				25,990		30,597
	SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT										
241	GUN FIRE CONTROL EQUIPMENT		29,918		19,188				19,188		19,590
242	COAST GUARD GUN SYSTEM	3	28,777	2	20,930			2	20,930		
	SHIP MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT										
243	MK 92 FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM		2,832		3,471				3,471	3	45,886
244	HARPOON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		12,664		13,041				13,041		18,384
245	TERRIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		111,920		56,810				56,810		34,768
246	TARTAR SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		106,584		47,052				47,052		132,154
247	POINT DEFENSE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT (MYP)		11,842		42,314				42,314		20,645
248	AIRBORNE ECM/ECCM		1,044		1,061				1,061		1,095

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
249	AEGIS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		56,985		60,592				60,592		41,304
250	SURFACE TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		83,801		109,593				109,593		87,102
251	SUBMARINE TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		18,821		11,916				11,916		9,007
252	VERTICAL LAUNCH SYSTEM	3	100,233	4	137,767			4	137,767	4	147,011
	FBM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
253	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		146,893		105,318				105,318		124,997
254	STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT								0		
	ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
255	MK 117 FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM	35	57,505	29	54,187			29	54,187	46	84,620
256	SUBMARINE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		24,531		23,336				23,336		20,873
257	SURFACE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		20,175		24,886				24,886		21,920
258	MK 116 FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM	5	23,906	4	40,929			4	40,929	10	58,440
259	ASW RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		6,272		5,429				5,429		6,410
	OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
260	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP		10,625		15,238				15,238		15,529
261	SWIMMER WEAPONS SYSTEMS		847		847				847		4,651
262	UNMANNED SEABORNE TARGET		7,670		2,872				2,872		8,026
263	ANTI-SHIP MISSILE DECOY SYSTEMS	5	4,606	5	6,362			5	6,362	6	7,760
264	CALIBRATION EQUIPMENT		3,276		6,290				6,290		6,298
265	STOCK SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT		2,080		2,096				2,096		2,133
266	ORDNANCE FACILITIES EQUIPMENT								0		
267	OTHER ORDNANCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT		1,492		2,362				2,362		2,398
	OTHER EXPENDABLE ORDNANCE										
268	SMALL ARMS AND LANDING PARTY AMMO		21,645		31,002				31,002		38,731
269	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION MATERIAL		21,223		29,613				29,613		29,174
270	QUICKSTRIKE		39,714		29,852				29,852		43,035
271	FLEET MINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		24,761		20,692				20,692		31,254
272	MINE NEUTRALIZATION DEVICES		2,599		2,719				2,719		4,088
273	DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY MATERIAL		7,892		7,435				7,435		10,833
274	SHIPBOARD EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES		29,255		18,264				18,264		47,009
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS										
275	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS								0		
	SUBTOTAL, ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		1,241,480		1,259,820		0		1,259,820		1,463,102

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
276	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	804	10,085	810	10,925			810	10,925	690	9,974
277	ARMORED SEDANS	1	95						0	1	94
278	TRUCKS	2,539	39,024	2,639	38,335			2,639	38,335	2,139	40,706
279	TRAILERS	271	3,726	326	4,811			326	4,811	278	4,264
280	CRUSH, MIX, BATCH, PAVE EQUIPMENT		4,774		4,987				4,987		5,054
281	DRILLING AND BLASTING EQUIPMENT		2,649		3,094				3,094		2,703
282	EARTH MOVING EQUIPMENT	179	15,700	300	11,244			300	11,244	299	18,452
283	LIGHTING AND POWER GENERATING EQUIP		3,460		2,415				2,415		2,416
284	MISC CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE EQUIP		3,626		5,957				5,957		8,701
285	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT	69	6,859	60	4,680			60	4,680	130	14,564
286	WEIGHT HANDLING EQUIPMENT	80	12,578	82	13,210			82	13,210	83	13,246
287	AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT		72,998		32,987				32,987		41,034
288	COMBAT CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		9,521		9,296				9,296		10,340
289	TELEPHONE EQUIPMENT		36						0		
290	MOBILE UTILITIES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		6,616		2,152				2,152		2,270
291	COLLATERAL EQUIPMENT				2,284				2,284		1,468
292	OCEAN CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT				1,318				1,318		1,361
293	FLEET MOORINGS		7,336		4,460				4,460		12,417
294	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT		2,653		1,932				1,932		3,050
295	OTHER CIVIL ENG SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				2,625				2,625		2,712
296	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS								0		
297	FLEET HOSPITALS	1	27,654	4	110,548			4	110,548	3	82,723
	SUBTOTAL, CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		229,390		267,260		0		267,260		277,549
	SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
298	FORKLIFT TRUCKS	243	9,028	392	9,518			392	9,518	730	20,077
299	OTHER MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT		3,326		3,290				3,290		2,370
300	AUTOMATED MATERIALS HANDLING SYSTEMS		12,917		23,783				23,783		29,327
301	OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				9,023				9,023		9,321

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
302	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT		2,288						0		
303	SPECIAL ACTIVITIES, NAVY								0		
304	SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS		31,300		36,609				36,609		77,122
	SUBTOTAL, SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		58,859		82,223		0		82,223		138,217
	PERSONNEL AND COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
	TRAINING DEVICES										
305	SURFACE SONAR TRAINERS		35,792		33,368				33,368		31,266
306	SUBMARINE SONAR TRAINERS		6,923		8,546				8,546		11,670
307	SURFACE COMBAT SYSTEM TRAINERS		23,694		25,487				25,487		29,636
308	SUBMARINE COMBAT SYSTEM TRAINERS		11,916		30,319				30,319		35,841
309	SHIP SYSTEM TRAINERS		15,268		16,217				16,217		43,184
310	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS								0		
311	TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIP		2,353		12,632				12,632		11,428
312	TRAINING DEVICE MODIFICATIONS		6,666		3,340				3,340		4,377
	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
313	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				14,540				14,540		13,774
314	EDUCATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				4,966				4,966		5,130
315	MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		61,423		25,085				25,085		28,727
316	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		41,624		52,823				52,823		78,013
317	ITEMS UNDER 900K		1,218		1,032				1,032		147
318	OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				21,331				21,331		22,036
319	NAVAL RESERVE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				4,992				4,992		5,157
320	OCEANOGRAPHIC SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		14,000		25,592				25,592		26,438
321	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		12,416		31,087				31,087		35,592
	COMPUTER ACQUISITION PROGRAM										
322	COMPUTER ACQUISITION PROGRAM		163,496		221,279				221,279		242,402
323	NAVAL WAR GAMING SYSTEM								0		
324	NONCENTRALLY MANAGED ITEMS		125,300						0		

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	PRODUCTIVITY PROGRAMS										
325	PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENT FUND (PIF)		4,393		20,245				20,245		96
326	PROD ENHANCING INCENTIVE FUND (PEIF)				3,414				3,414		9,783
	SUBTOTAL, PERSONNEL AND COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		526,482		556,295		0		556,295		634,697
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS										
327	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		260,030		323,892		0		323,892		409,410
	UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION		---		---		-400,000		-400,000		---
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		---		---		-1,143		-1,143		---
	PRIOR YEAR PROGRAM SAVINGS (FY 86)		---		---		-16,000		-16,000		---
	TOTAL, NAVY OTHER PROCUREMENT		6,381,282		6,538,800		-417,143		6,121,657		7,755,448

SEALIFT SUPPORT

The committee has followed the Sealift Support Facilities Program with interest. Achieving sufficient logistics over the shore (LOTS) capability for locations without developed port facilities should remain a priority program.

Recognizing the competing requirements for funds, the committee urges the Department of the Navy to continue to provide adequate support to complete this important program at an early date.

The Department of the Navy is encouraged to reprogram funds from available savings to stabilize the procurement of this important program.

ORDNANCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT

The administration requested $2.4 million for other ordnance training equipment in fiscal year 1987. The request was fully funded and no undistributed reduction shall apply to this program.

SEASHEDS

The Navy has continued to award seasheds production contracts to two firms under a Small Business Administration program and recently has instituted competition which has lowered costs. The committee strongly endorses continued competition in the procurement of sealift support equipment.

The committee is concerned, however, about variations in the seashed acquisition schedule which complicate program management and threaten efficient production rates. The Navy should be mindful of the importance of large programs to small businesses and endeavor to make acquisition rates more predictable. The committee will scrutinize the Navy's execution of this program to ensure that production continues at an efficient rate.

MK-45 GUN MOUNT AND MK-6 AMMUNITION HOIST

The administration requested approval of a multiyear contract for procurement of Mark 45 gun mounts and Mark 6 ammunition hoists, which would be installed on new construction cruisers and destroyers.

A multiyear procurement contract for 22 mounts and hoists would reduce total costs by $48.7 million through 1994, a savings of about 21%. Because of the contracts' structure, however, outlays during fiscal years 1987-1989 would be increased by $47 million relative to annual contracts. The present value of the total savings would be $15.4 million.

The committee recommends against authorization of a multiyear procurement contract for Mark 45 gun mounts and Mark 6 ammunition hoists. The longer term savings are not worth the near term cost in additional outlays.

OPN UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION

The committee recommends an undistributed reduction of $400.0 million against the Navy's Other Procurement account. This reduction is made to comply with budget constraints.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to make these reductions throughout the first year of execution. In this manner, actual cost savings and program delays can absorb a significant portion of the reduction, minimizing program reductions and cancellations in advance of execution. It is not expected that these reductions will be identified in time to be reflected in the President's fiscal year 1988 budget request. Instead, the committee requests a report by November 1, 1987 as to where these reductions were taken, indicating the basis for each reduction.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	AMMUNITION										
1	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES		3,194						0		2,215
2	SMALL ARMS AMO, ALL TYPES		12,791		18,539				18,539		15,358
3	MACHINE GUN AMMO, ALL TYPES		35,729		32,003				32,003		28,907
4	MORTAR AMMO, ALL TYPES		28,889		216,774				216,774		59,370
5	GRENADES, ALL TYPES		2,202		8,311				8,311		11,832
6	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		61,422		41,279		2,900		44,179		56,049
7	TRAINING AMMO, ALL TYPES		34,513		31,117				31,117		77,665
8	155MM AMMO, ALL TYPES		233,612		202,048		-17,600		184,448		240,606
9	ANTI-ARMOR AMMO, ALL TYPES								0		49,478
10	155MM PROJ COPPERHEAD		53,670		37,831				37,831		93,866
11	8 INCH AMMO, ALL TYPES		11,238				14,700		14,700		6,921
12	FUZES, ALL TYPES		31,258		12,893				12,893		5,853
13	AMMO MODERNIZATION		5,721		4,197				4,197		3,008
	OTHER SUPPORT										
14	ITEMS LESS THAN $900K		3,863		3,331				3,331		4,956
	SUBTOTAL, AMMUNITION		518,102		608.323		0		608,323		656,084
	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES										
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES										
15	ORD/VEH SPT EQUIPMENT								0		
16	AAV7A1 PIP			100	14,268			100	14,268	233	31,808
17	LVT7 WPN SYSTEM								0		
18	LVT7 SERVICE LIFE EXT PROG								0		
19	LIGHT ARMORED VEHICLE								0		
20	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS								0		
21	MODIFICATION KITS (TRKD VEH)	756	1,693		1,005				1,005		2,487
22	M-1 MAIN BATTLE TANK								0		7,618

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
23	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)								0		35,043
24	RECOVERY VEHICLE M88	5	4,544						0		
25	BRIDGE, ARMORED VEH LAUNCHED	16	8,640	8	4,480			8	4,480		
26	ITEMS LESS THAN $900K (TRKD VEH)		1,476						0		13
	ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS										
27	POS AZIMUTH DETERM SYS (PADS)			17	5,633			17	5,633	11	3,734
28	BATTERY COMPUTER SYSTEM	166	26,345						0		
29	M198 155MM HOWITZER	50	26,301	94	44,954			94	44,954		
30	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS								0		
31	ITEMS LESS THAN $900K (ATL-OTH)		2,586		1,295				1,295		467
	WEAPONS										
32	9MM HANDGUN	10,000	2,370	22,181	5,432			22,181	5,432	22,182	5,405
33	MACHINE GUN, AUTO SAW 5.56MM			1,000	3,440			1,000	3,440	1,000	3,607
34	M-16 5.56MM RIFLE	28,186	11,993	17,725	7,865			17,725	7,865	19,869	8,833
35	MK-19 40MM MACHINE GUN	103	1,000	189	1,912			189	1,912	189	1,902
36	EOD EQUIPMENT								0		
37	MORTAR, MED. EXTENDED RANGE			350	7,467			350	7,467	264	5,682
38	SMAW 81MM ROCKET	535.	4,676						0		
	SUBTOTAL, WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES		91,624		97,751		0		97,751		106,599
	GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT										
	GUIDED MISSILES										
39	HAWK	550	122,665	430	115,372			430	115,372	550	147,480
40	HAWK MOD		39,078		24,269				24,269		27,918
41	STINGER	800	57,897	1,442	69,284			1,442	69,284	1,900	88,596
42	DRAGON MISSILE SYSTEM								0		5,637
43	TOW	4,238	39,505	3,400	33,524			3,400	33,524	3,400	34,440
	OTHER SUPPORT										
44	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS								0		
45	MODIFICATION KITS		712		744				744		7,650
	SUBTOTAL, GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT		259,857		243,193		0		243,193		311,721

86

		FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
LINE NO.	PROGRAM	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT										
	MANPACK RADIOS										
46	MANPACK RADIOS AND EQUIP		12,656		2,662				2,662		2,867
	VEHICLE MOUNTED RADIOS AND EQUIPMENT										
47	VEHICLE MTD RADIOS & EQUIPMENT		10,366		1,482				1,482		
	TELEPHONE AND TELETYPE EQUIPMENT										
48	UNIT LEVEL CIRCUIT SWITCH (ULCS)		12,600		74,199				74,199		87,614
49	ULCS LIFE CYCLE SUPPORT		15,361		8,035				8,035		5,234
50	TACT COMM CENTER EQUIP		3,970	13	199			13	199		16,341
51	SB-3614(V)TT AUTO TELEPHONE SWITCHBOARD								0		
52	AN/PSC( ) DIGITAL COMM TERMINAL			472	15,174			472	15,174	960	28,187
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT										
53	PP 6224/4 POWER SUPPLY								0	307	871
54	AN/USM 323 GEN SGNL, ELECTRONIC	456	5,580						0		
55	AUTO TEST EQUIP SYS	45	5,186	51	6,145			51	6,145	24	2,846
56	CALIBRATION FACILITY ELECTRONIC				9,830				9,830		8,737
57	MAINTENANCE COMPLEX, ELECTRONIC		5,306		10,599				10,599		10,437
58	ELECTRONIC TEST EQUIP (TEL)		1,000	10	2,706			10	2,706	8	3,681
	OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT										
59	PP 7333 POWER SUPPLY	1,012	3,813						0		
60	AN/TRQ 35(V)TACTICAL FREQ MANAGEMENT SYS								0		
61	TACT FACSIMILE SET AN/GXC-7	359	6,725						0		
62	ANDVT/TACTERM	34	1,513	75	2,681			75	2,681	75	2,672
63	TIME DIVERSITY MODEM MX () (TL)								0		
64	HAVE QUICK TIMING DISTR SYSTEM								0		13,724
65	SINGLE CHAN GRD & AIR RADIO								0	6,850	37,300
	OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)										
66	TEST CALIB + MAINT SPT		1,000		1,638				1,638		1,568
67	REPLENISHMENT SPARES (TEL)								0		
68	SPARES (TEL)								0		
69	MODIFICATION KITS (TEL)		3,219	1	3,690			1	3,690		2,841
70	ITEMS LESS THAN $900K (TEL)		1,153		811				811		677

		FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION	
LINE NO.	PROGRAM	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	COMMAND + CONTROL SYSTEMS (NON-TEL)										
71	POS LOCATING RPTG SYSTEM (PLRS)	2	46,384						0	2	36,148
72	TACTICAL AIR OPER MODULE (TAOM)	3	71,550	7	50,458			7	50,458	9	54,002
73	AN/UYQ 4 SEMI AUTO, DIRECT AIR SUPPORT CENTRAL				6,310				6,310		10,323
	RADAR + EQUIPMENT (NON TEL)										
74	AN/TPS 59 DECOY	5	6,109						0		
75	AN/PPN-19 RADAR TRANSPONDER	255	13,192						0		
76	AN/TPS 32 DECOY								0	4	6,585
	INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)										
77	AIRBORNE RADIO DIRECTION FINDER								0	20	10,640
78	JINTACS/JAMS								0	165	5,804
79	METEORLOGICAL DATA SYSTEM	9	13,338						0		
80	MOBILE EW SUP SYS (MEWSS)			12	15,367			12	15,367		
81	GRD BASED ELECT INTELL SPT SYS								0	3	7,760
	REPAIR + TEST EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)										
82	ELECTRONIC TDME REPAIR FACILITY			6	4,684			6	4,684	6	4,501
83	STE/ICE SIMPL TEST EQ			264	1,296			264	1,296	261	1,278
84	MECH TEST TMDE			1	2,446			1	2,446	1	2,280
85	ELECTRONIC TEST EQUIP (NONTEL)		1,000		3,344				3,344		2,673
	OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)										
86	PP 7286 BATTERY CHARGER								0		
87	CAMPS								0	4	1,107
88	MOD UNIV LASER EQUIP (MULE)								0		
89	NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT		10,823		1,927				1,927		6,538
90	PROD ENHANCEMENT		5,016						0		
91	ADP EQUIPMENT	1	19,050		46,125				46,125		55,739
92	CP-696()/PD RADIAC INDIC COMPUTER								0	1	6,228
	OTHER SUPPORT (NON TEL)										
93	TEST CALIB & MAINT SPT (NON-TEL)		1,582		1,638				1,638		1,568
94	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS								0		
95	MODIFICATION KITS (NONTEL)	42	8,433	13	4,445			13	4,445	44	11,909
96	ITEMS LESS THAN $900K (NONTEL)		1,799		970				970		1,779
	SUBTOTAL, COMMUNICATIONS & ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT		287,724		278,861		0		278,861		452,459

						COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION					
		FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION	
LINE NO.	PROGRAM	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	SUPPORT VEHICLES										
	ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES										
97	COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES	203	2,702		2,278				2,278		2,568
98	COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES		20,121	1	3,814			1	3,814	1	12,899
	TACTICAL VEHICLES										
99	UTILITY MOTORCYCLE								0	231	893
100	5/4T TRUCK HMMWV	4,832	113,041	743	18,760			743	18,760		
101	A/C FIRE/RESCUE VEHICLE	6	1,006						0		
102	TRUCKS, 5 TON, ALL TYPES	470	46,162						0		
103	5 TON RETROFIT	691	7,177	209	5,230			209	5,230		
104	COMMERCIAL UTILITY CARGO VEHICLE								0		
105	LOGISTICS VEHICLE SYSTEM	719	69,148	1,210	103,994			1,210	103,994	382	28,639
106	TRAILERS, ALL TYPES		10,836		7,656				7,656		4,012
107	LUBE AND SERVICE UNIT 15CFM	70	1,331	39	755			39	755	30	572
	OTHER SUPPORT										
108	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS								0		
109	MODIFICATION KITS		4,338		3,194				3,194		10,500
110	ITEMS LESS THAN $900K		1,140		388				388		733
	SUBTOTAL, SUPPORT VEHICLES		277,002		146,069		0		146,069		60,816
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT										
	ENGINEER AND EQUIPMENT										
111	PUMP REFUELER FUEL DISP								0		
112	MINE CLEARANCE SYSTEM KIT (LVTP-7)								0		
113	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQ ASSORT		1,728		1,445				1,445		4,314
114	HEAVY RT CRANE			71	26,027			71	26,027	97	33,843
115	LIGHT RT CRANE								0	200	20,588
116	GRADER ROAD MOTORIZED	118	8,370	63	4,407			63	4,407		
117	TRACTORS, ALL TYPES		12,094		30,090				30,090		25,319
118	RUNWAY SWEEPER, VACUUM	18	2,157						0		
119	SHOP EQ GEN PUR REP SEMI-TRLRM	28	4,669						0		
120	CONTAINER HNDLR, ROUGH TERR	27	7,486						0		
121	FORKLIFTS, ALL TYPES		10,540		6,879				6,879		36,303

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
122	LAUNDRY UNIT SKID MTD			60	2,744			60	2,744	55	2,509
123	FIELD BATH SHOWER UNIT	100	2,349	100	2,431			100	2,431	100	2,427
124	REFRIGERATION UNIT	528	1,347	272	684			272	684		
125	REFRIGERATION BOX	218	1,798						0	28	217
126	REV OSMOSIS/WATER PUR 600 GL	178	11,166	34	4,184			34	4,184		
127	M-33 ICE CREAM PLANT THOMPSON								0	60	937
128	WATER SUPPLY SUPPORT SYSTEM								0		
129	FIELD WIRING HARNESS			749	5,375			749	5,375	567	4,060
130	FUEL & WATER PUMP & STORAGE MODULE		4,056		4,880				4,880		8,284
131	AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT FUEL SYSTEM	5	5,882						0	2	2,421
132	HELO EXPED REFUELING SYS	6	652						0		
133	TACT AIRFIELD FUEL DISP SYS								0	4	1,478
134	TOPOGRAPHIC REPRODUCTION EQUIPMENT TRL								0	6	2,614
135	SURVEY EQUIP F/CONST USE			16	924			16	924		
136	WET GAP BRIDGE SYSTEM			168	6,190			168	6,190	168	5,423
137	BOAT BRIDGE	21	2,582	14	1,698			14	1,698		
138	MEDIUM GIRDER BRIDGE	20	10,926						0		
139	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED		8,260		5,999				5,999		24,818
140	MOB ELECT POWER DIST SYS (MEPDIS)	17	4,982	4	2,976			4	2,976		
141	CONVENTIONAL MINE LAYING SYSTEM								0	143	1,863
142	CLEARED LANE MARKING SYSTEM								0	100	4,014
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT										
143	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMET		2,788		10,506				10,506		13,256
144	GARRISON MOBILE ENGR EQUIP		5,698		3,975				3,975		5,289
145	TELEPHONE SYSTEM		4,300		5,226				5,226		
146	AUTO MAT HANDLING EQUIP		691		1,035				1,035		1,839
147	HQMC ITEMS		1,000		1,307				1,307		646
148	MATERIEL HANDLING EQUIP		1,509		2,309				2,309		2,387
	GENERAL PROPERTY										
149	LTWT DECONTAMINAION SYSTEM								0	216	2,886
150	TRN DEVICES (AUDIO VISUAL)		1,635		1,761				1,761		1,862
151	TRN DEVICES (SIMULATORS)		10,408	1	5,615			1	5,615	1	8,223
152	SHELTER FAMILY	870	17,361	326	7,154			326	7,154	1,597	28,278
153	CONTAINER FAMILY	4,900	6,969	10,570	15,163			10,570	15,163	11,300	15,832

		FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
LINE NO.	PROGRAM	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
154	CHEMICAL ALARM SYSTEM	778	1,870						0	948	2,288
155	CHEMICAL PROTECTION EQUIPMENT								0		5,000
156	DECON APPARATUS PWR DRIVEN	65	1,201	18	321			18	321		
157	SANITATION EQUIPMENT KITCHEN			78	1,252			78	1,252		
	OTHER SUPPORT										
158	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS								0		
159	MODIFICATION KITS		2,764		354				354		
160	ITEMS LESS THAN $900K		4,086		3,218				3,218		3,561
	SUBTOTAL, ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT		163,324		166,129		0		166,129		272,779
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS										
161	SPARES & REPAIR PARTS		42,133		14,151				14,151		16,234
162	REPLENISHMENT SPARES		21,000		10,523				10,523		32,422
	SUBTOTAL, SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		63,133		24,674		0		24,674		48,656
	UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION		---		---		-79,000		-79,000		---
	PRIOR YEAR PROGRAM SAVINGS (FY 86)		---		---		-9,000		-9,000		---
	TOTAL, MARINE CORPS PROCUREMENT		1,660,766		1,565,000		-88,000		1,477,000		1,909,114

PREPAREDNESS SUBCOMMITTEE PROGRAMS

In the funding line items under the oversight of the Preparedness Subcommittee, the administration requested $634.4 million. This amount represents growth of 17.9 percent over the fiscal year 1986 level. These line items show a large increase because the Marine Corps is trying to overcome large shortfalls in ammunition and weapons. The committee fully supports full funding for this request.

No undistributed reduction shall apply to these programs.

UNIT LEVEL CIRCUIT SWITCH

The committee understands the Marine Corps' urgent operational need for the 150-line unit level circuit switch. An alternative acquisition strategy has been proposed which would permit the Marine Corps and Air Force to begin procurement of a 150-line switch beginning in fiscal year 1987. The strategy requires the selected equipment to undergo an operational test shortly after contract award. This test will be conducted by the Marine Corps Operational Test and Evaluation Activity (MCOTEA), which will prepare an Independent Evaluation Report (IER) on the test. The Marine Corps may exercise production options in fiscal year 1987 for the 150-line switch if the operational evaluation recommends approval for service use of the equipment. No procurement funds shall be obligated prior to the completion of the operational evaluation.

The committee endorses this strategy and recommends authorization of the administration's request for both the Marine Corps and Air Force. The committee requests the Marine Corps provide a copy of the Independent Evaluation Report to the House and Senate committees on Armed Services upon its completion.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT										
	STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE										
1	ACM INTEGRATION		96,000						0		
2	B-1B (MYP)	48	4,952,900						0		
3	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)								0		
	TACTICAL FORCES										
4	AIR DEFENSE COMPETITION	10	192,000	20	296,300	-20	-296,300	0	0	60	650,700
5	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)				114,600		-114,600		0		126,500
6	F-15 D/E	48	1,687,300	48	1,675,400			48	1,675,400	48	1,751,300
7	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		201,600		218,900				218,900		230,900
8	F-16 C/D (MYP)	180	2,492,000	216	2,881,900	-24	-235,000	192	2,646,900	216	2,995,500
9	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		514,100		612,000		-126,000		486,000		669,000
	OTHER COMBAT AIRCRAFT										
10	KC-10A (ATCA) (MYP)	12	196,600	8	104,400			8	104,400		
11	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		219,800						0		
12	AC-130H GUNSHIP	1	33,400						0	5	237,800
13	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)				18,200				18,200		59,200
14	MC-130H	2	119,100	5	229,700			5	229,700	5	226,000
15	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		11,700		15,100				15,100		15,800
	SUBTOTAL, COMBAT AIRCRAFT		10,716,500		6,166,500		-771,900		5,394,600		6,962,700
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT										
	STRATEGIC AIRLIFT										
16	C-5B	16	1,735,000	21	1,937,378			21	1,937,378		
17	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		313,800						0		
	TACTICAL AIRLIFT										
18	C-17				182,300				182,300	2	1,313,700
19	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)				35,000				35,000		69,100

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
20	C 130H								0		
	OTHER AIRLIFT										
21	C 12D								0		
22	C 12J								0	6	20,800
23	C 20A	8	147,700						0		
24	VC-X	2	280,000		34,500		-34,500		0		
	SUBTOTAL, AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT		2,476,500		2,189,178		34,500		2,154,678		1,403,600
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT										
	UPT TRAINERS										
25	T 46A (NGT)										
26	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)										
	SUBTOTAL, TRAINER AIRCRAFT		0		0		0		0		0
	OTHER AIRCRAFT										
	HELICOPTERS										
27	HH 60								0		
	MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT										
28	CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C			38	1,600			38	1,600	38	1,600
29	FLIGHT INSPECT ACFT REPLACEMENT								0		
30	RANGE CONTROL AIRCRAFT								0		
	OTHER AIRCRAFT										
31	TR 1/U 2	6	287,900	3	94,549			3	94,549	3	59,181
32	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		8,600						0		
	SUBTOTAL, OTHER AIRCRAFT		296,500		96,149		0		96,149		60,781
	MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE AIRCRAFT										
	STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT										
33	B 52		416,200		413,400		-158,600		254,800		387,500
34	FB 111		8,700		3,300				3,300		2,400
35	B 1B		31,400		96,400		-6,400		90,000		131,500

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	TACTICAL AIRCRAFT										
36	A 7		60,000		14,100				14,100		36,700
37	A 10		69,500		52,600				52,600		46,200
38	F/RF-4		183,800		119,400				119,400		298,400
39	F-5		28,532		5,500				5,500		6,000
40	F-15		106,500		269,000				269,000		295,300
41	F-16		52,300		87,700				87,700		151,400
42	F-111		298,700		273,200				273,200		257,300
43	EF-111								0		60,700
44	TR-1A		9,800		9,300				9,300		24,800
45	T/AT-37								0		9,600
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT										
46	C-5		9,800		46,800				46,800		101,500
47	C 9				200				200		7,500
48	C-137				200				200		800
49	C-141		4,900		10,900				10,900		12,300
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT										
50	T-38		27,800		39,500				39,500		51,100
51	T-43				400				400		400
	OTHER AIRCRAFT										
52	KC-10A (ATCA)		1,000		6,700				6,700		7,700
53	C 12		1,500						0		
54	C 130		180,200		212,900				212,900		234,600
55	C 135		902,500		1,077,400		-80,000		997,400		982,700
56	E-3		4,100		33,500				33,500		32,400
57	E-4		20,100		16,000		-11,000		5,000		12,500
58	H-1				11,200				11,200		8,800
59	H-3 AIRCRAFT SYSTEM				1,500				1,500		10,500
60	HH-53 AIRCRAFT		87,600		55,300				55,300		52,400
61	OTHER AIRCRAFT		109,200		153,300				153,300		107,500
62	OV-10								0		3,400
	OTHER MODIFICATIONS										
63	CLASSIFIED PROJECTS		112,385		91,611				91,611		90,336
64	SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS								0		

		FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION	
LINE NO.	PROGRAM	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	CIVIL RESERVE AIRLIFT FLEET (CRAF)										
65	CIVIL RESERVE AIRLIFT FLEET (CRAF)		158,800						0		
	SUBTOTAL, MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE AIRCRAFT		2,885,317		3,101,311		-256,000		2,845,311		3,424,236
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS										
66	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		3,811,105		3,477,903		-49,600		3,428,303		4,449,651
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES										
67	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		535,497		321,370				321,370		423,624
68	INDUSTRIAL RESPONSIVENESS		51,900		38,400				38,400		55,500
69	WAR CONSUMABLES		83,200		51,100				51,100		116,000
70	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		2,174,005		3,685,489		-100,000		3,585,489		3,745,197
	SUBTOTAL, AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES		2,844,602		4,096,359		-100,000		3,996,359		4,340,321
	UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION		---		---		-90,000		-90,000		---
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		---		[ ]		-3,160		-3,160		---
	PRIOR YEAR PROGRAM SAVINGS (FY 85)		---		---		-117,400		-117,400		--
	PRIOR YEAR PROGRAM SAVINGS (FY 86)		---		---		-219,936		-219,936		---
	TOTAL, AIR FORCE AIRCRAFT		23,030,524		19,127,400		-1,642,496		17,484,904		20,641,289

AIR DEFENSE FIGHTER COMPETITION

The administration requested $296.3 million for the procurement of 20 air defense aircraft in fiscal year 1987 and $114.6 million in advance procurement for fiscal year 1988.

As a result of congressionally mandated reductions in the defense budget, the committee believes that the expenditure of more than $3.0 billion for the procurement of new fighter aircraft to perform the continental air defense mission is unjustified. The committee believes that less expensive, albeit less capable, methods should be explored to modernize our air defense forces.

The committee recommends no funds be authorized for the procurement of air defense fighter aircraft in fiscal year 1987.

F-15 (EAGLE)

The administration requested $1,675.4 million for the procurement of 48 F-15E aircraft in fiscal year 1987 and $218.9 million in advance procurement for 48 aircraft in fiscal year 1988.

The F-15 Eagle is a twin engine, all weather, high performance interdiction and air superiority fighter.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request for the F-15 Eagle.

F-16 (FALCON)

The administration requested $2,881.9 million for the procurement of 216 F-16 aircraft in fiscal year 1987 and $612.0 million in advance procurement for 216 aircraft in fiscal year 1988.

The F-16 is a multi-mission, single pilot, high performance fighter. It is both an outstanding close-in, air-to-air combat aircraft as well as a highly effective air-to-surface attack aircraft.

The committee recommends an authorization of $2,646.9 million for the procurement of 192 F-16 aircraft in fiscal year 1987 and $486.0 million in advance procurement for 216 aircraft in 1988. The reduction of $235.0 million in procurement and $126.0 in advance procurement is strictly the result of budgetary constraints and is made without prejudice.

MC-130 (COMBAT TALON)

The administration requested $229.7 million for the procurement of 5 MC-130 Combat Talon aircraft in fiscal year 1987 and $15.1 million in advance procurement for 5 aircraft in fiscal year 1988.

The MC-130 Combat Talon is a specially modified C-130 aircraft equipped to support special operations forces.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request for MC-130 Combat Talon aircraft.

C-17 AIRLIFTER

The C-17 program is discussed in the section on RDT&E, Air Force.

B-52 MODIFICATIONS

The administration requested $413.4 million for modifications to the B-52 bomber fleet. The funds requested will continue modifications to B-52G and H aircraft. The majority of the fiscal year 1987 request is to provide for internal cruise missile carriage related modifications to the B-52Hs, and to provide electronic countermeasure (ECM) improvements and radar upgrades to the entire B-52 fleet.

The committee strongly supports the cruise missile related modifications, since they clearly support the long term plans for the employment of the B-52H aircraft. Due to budgetary considerations, the committee recommends a reduction of $158.6 million associated with the radar upgrade and B-52G ALQ-172 PAVE MINT ECM modifications.

C-135 MODIFICATIONS

The administration requested a total of $1,077.4 million in fiscal year 1987 for modifications to the C-135 aircraft fleet. Of this amount, $862.2 million is associated with the KC-135R reengining program. Under this program, existing KC-135 tanker aircraft are reengined with the CFM-56 engine and other associated modifications are made. The administration's request would increase from 43 to 50 the number of KC-135 tanker reengining kits procured this year, which will result in cost savings due to increased efficiencies. This program also funds modifications to the command post aircraft, and the airborne launch control center aircraft that will support the Peacekeeper deployment.

The committee continues to support the KC-135R program as the most cost effective means to address the current shortfall in the U.S. aerial refueling capability. Therefore, the committee recommends authorization of $997.4 million for the modification of C-135 aircraft—including 50 KC-135R reengining kits. This authorization reflects a favorable pricing adjustment of $30 million for the reengining program, and a recommendation that the $50.0 million appropriated in fiscal year 1986 for Command Post Upgrades be carried forward and applied to the fiscal year 1987 procurement.

PRIOR YEAR SAVINGS

The committee has identified $117.4 million in prior year savings in airlift programs in the Aircraft Procurement, Air Force account. All of these funds are derived from excess funding in the C-5B program.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	BALLISTIC MISSILES										
	STRATEGIC										
1	PEACEKEEPER (M X)	12	1,676,000	21	1,418,131			21	1,418,131	48	2,131,616
	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT - BALLISTIC										
2	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC		63,901		69,696				69,696		63,156
	SUBTOTAL, BALLISTIC MISSILES		1,739,901		1,487,827		0		1,487,827		2,194,772
	OTHER MISSILES										
	STRATEGIC										
3	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE		[ ]		[ ]				[ ]		[ ]
4	ADVANCED PROCUREMENT (CY)		[ ]		[ ]				[ ]		[ ]
5	SRAM II								0		2,022
6	AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE		32,640		12,407				12,407		2,470
	TACTICAL										
7	AIM-7F/M SPARROW	497	77,900	379	64,887			379	64,887	523	104,147
8	AIM-9L/M SIDEWINDER	1,650	76,900	1,710	95,636			1,710	95,636	956	55,476
9	ACM-130 POWERED GBU-15	5	19,000	51	26,577			51	26,577	73	55,277
10	AGM-65D MAVERICK	2,600	407,889	4,700	580,984	-1,100	-100,000	3,600	480,984	7,000	671,810
11	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)								0		
12	HARPOON								0		
13	AGM-88A HARM	1,450	414,807	2,130	493,382			2,130	493,382	1,748	402,654
14	RAPIER		7,581		6,400				6,400		48,800
15	AMRAAM		149,589	260	656,628			260	656,628	833	877,796
16	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		59,400		89,900				89,900		118,400
17	GRD LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE	95	505,793	76	128,600			76	128,600	37	57,839
18	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		9,372		4,600				4,600		
19	STINGER				1,709				1,709		

		FY 86		FY 87		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88	
		FINAL		REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION		PROJECTION	
LINE NO.	PROGRAM	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	TARGET DRONES										
20	TARGET DRONES		34,298		19,637				19,637		30,071
	TACTICAL DRONES										
21	TACTICAL DRONES		[ ]		[ ]				[ ]		[ ]
	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES										
22	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		20,626		14,458				14,458		14,051
	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT - OTHER										
23	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-OTHER		13,750		17,205				17,205		15,557
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		480,400		841,573				841,573		874,830
	SUBTOTAL, OTHER MISSILES		2,309,945		3,054,583		-100,000		2,954,583		3,331,200
	MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE MISSILES										
	CLASS IV										
24	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS				4,367				4,367		24,949
25	LGM-30F/G MINUTEMAN II/III		126,746		105,589		-12,400		93,189		133,383
26	AGM-88A HARM		2,300		2,859				2,859		2,367
27	AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE		15,298		16,560				16,560		7,653
28	GRD LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE		8,707		15,294				15,294		16,198
29	PEACEKEEPER (M-X)								0		1,323
30	MODIFICATIONS UNDER $2.0M		2,594		1,858				1,858		1,951
	SUBTOTAL, MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE MISSILES		155,645		146,527		-12,400		134,127		187,824
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS										
31	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		441,670		334,166		0		334,166		346,702
	OTHER SUPPORT										
	SPACE PROGRAMS										
32	SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC)		34,346		61,899				61,899		24,817
33	GLOBAL POSITIONING (MYP)	9	197,398	8	129,665			8	129,665	4	60,385
34	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)								0		43,200
35	SPACE SHUTTLE OPERATIONS		240,699		59,062				59,062		86,486
36	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)								0		22,800

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
37	DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG (MYP)		40,979		19,427				19,427		89,625
38	DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM (MYP)		124,082		108,515				108,515	1	382,458
39	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)				250,000				250,000		63,100
40	DEFENSE SATELLITE COMM SYSTEM (MYP)	2	127,406	2	117,131		-10,000	2	107,131	1	65,389
41	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		13,660		5,540				5,540		
42	AF SATELLITE COMM SYSTEM	1	22,584						0		
43	SPACE BOOSTERS			1	52,747		50,000	1	102,747	2	249,831
44	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		120,194		230,000		-50,000		180,000		99,000
45	SPACE DEFENSE SYSTEM								0		187,730
46	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)				28,481				28,461		145,000
47	SPACE SHUTTLE		20,973						0		
	SPECIAL PROGRAMS										
48	OTHER PROGRAMS				45,311				45,311		81,177
49	HAVE FLAG		[ ]		[ ]				[ ]		[ ]
50	FOREST GREEN		4,549		2,061				2,061		271
51	IONDS (MYP)		44,035		24,854				24,854		30,414
52	SPECIAL PROGRAMS		1,752,900		1,851,958				1,851,958		2,307,574
53	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS		243,876		206,346				206,346		240,368
53	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS		672,200		766,300				766,300		974,800
54	SPECIAL SUPPORT PROGRAMSU								0		
55	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		[ ]		[ ]		-180,000		-180,000		[ ]
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS								0		35,000
	SUBTOTAL, OTHER SUPPORT		3,669,801		3,959,297		-190,000		3,769,297		5,189,395
	PRIOR YEAR PROGRAM SAVINGS (FY 86)		---		---		-6,800		-6,800		---
	PRIOR YEAR PROGRAM SAVINGS (FY 85)		---		---		-61,800		-61,800		---
	TOTAL, AIR FORCE MISSILES		8,317,042		8,982,400		-371,000		8,611,400		11,249,893

AIM-7M SPARROW

The administration requested $64.9 million for the procurement of 379 AIM-7M Sparrow missiles for the Air Force in fiscal year 1987.

The AIM-7M Sparrow missile is a joint Navy/Air Force, medium range, air-to-air, radar guided missile. Inventory shortfalls of air-to-air missiles, particularly the radar guided Sparrow, have been identified by operational commanders as one of the most significant deficiencies in their warfighting posture.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request for Sparrow missiles.

AIM-9M SIDEWINDER

The administration requested $95.6 million for the procurement of 1,710 AIM-9M Sidewinder missiles for the Air Force in fiscal year 1987.

The AIM-9M Sidewinder is a joint Navy/Air Force short-range, air-to-air missile with heat seeking (infrared) guidance. The AIM-9M is the newest version of this very successful air-to-air missile.

The committee recommends authorization of the administration's request for the procurement of Sidewinder missiles.

AGM-65D IIR MAVERICK

The administration requested $581.0 million for the procurement of 4,700 AGM-65D Maverick missiles for the Air Force.

The AGM-65D Maverick is a rocket propelled, air-to-surface precision guided tactical missile. The IIR Maverick employs imaging infrared guidance and is intended for use day or night under conditions of limited visibility against such targets as tanks, armored personnel carriers, field fortifications, reinforced buildings, revetted targets and POL storage facilities.

The committee recommends an authorization of $481.0 million for the procurement of 3,600 IIR Maverick missiles in 1987. This reduction of 1,100 missiles and $100.0 million is based strictly on budgetary constraints and is made without prejudice. The committee fully supports the competitive procurement of the IIR Maverick. This reduction is in no way prejudicial to continuing the competitive acquisition strategy developed for Maverick.

AMRAAM (ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE)

The administration requested $656.6 million for the procurement of 260 Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAM) in fiscal year 1987 and $89.9 million for advance procurement of 833 missiles in 1988.

The AMRAAM is a medium range, radar guided, all-aspect air-to-air missile designed to replace the AIM-7 Sparrow in both the Air Force and Navy inventories. The AMRAAM is currently in full scale development, with the first procurement of missiles scheduled for fiscal year 1987.

The committee strongly endorses the requirement to develop an advanced beyond visual range (BVR) missile with a "launch and leave" capability to ensure the superiority of U.S. and NATO fighters.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request for the procurement of AMRAAM.

DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM (DSP)

The administration requested $108.5 million for procurement, $250.0 million for advanced procurement, and $138.2 million for research and development associated with the Defense Support Program (DSP) in fiscal year 1987. The Defense Support Program funds satellites that provide critical early warning of ballistic missile launches. The administration's request includes the initiation of a multiyear procurement for a block of five DSP satellites.

In view of the established requirement for these critical warning assets, and the substantial savings—estimated at over $300 million—associated with this multiyear procurement approach, the committee offers no objection to this proposal.

Finally, the committee notes that a substantial investment has and will continue to be made in research and development associated with a follow-on warning system. Accordingly, the committee recommends a reduction of $13.2 million in the research and development request for DSP, and expects that the acquisition of space based warning sensors beyond the proposed block of five satellites will incorporate technologies being pursued in the Boost Surveillance and Tracking System (BSTS) program under the Strategic Defense Initiative program.

SPACE BOOSTERS

The administration requested $52.7 million for procurement, and $230.0 million for advanced procurement of Space Boosters in fiscal year 1987. In addition, $138.7 million was requested for associated research and development. The space booster program utilizes existing Atlas and Titan expendable launch vehicles to launch critical Department of Defense payloads. In addition, the administration's fiscal year 1987 budget request for space boosters reflects the determination to complement the space shuttle with the procurement of expendable launch vehicles (ELVs). The committee notes, however, that the request does not fund the administration's recent recovery plan that off-loads selected payloads to ELVs.

In the wake of the tragic loss of the space shuttle Challenger, and the loss of two Titan and one Delta expendable launch vehicles, the critical importance to our national security of maintaining an assured access to space has become all too clear.

The committee strongly supports the administration's strategy for recovering assured access to space. Accordingly, the committee recommends authorization of the full amount requested for space boosters. The reallocation of $50.0 million in advanced procurement funds to the procurement account reflects fact of life changes that have occurred since submission of the administration's request.

In addition to the amount requested in fiscal year 1987, the administration has identified additional fiscal year 1986 and fiscal year 1987 funding requirements to implement the recovery plan. Funding for these additional requirements has been accommodated in the Senate version of the fiscal year 1986 Urgent Supplemental Appropriation bill.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	MUNITIONS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIPMENT										
	ROCKETS + LAUNCHERS										
1	2.75 INCH ROCKET MOTOR	98,004	22,276	100,000	23,684			100,000	23,684	100,000	25,843
2	2.75" ROCKET HEAD, W.P.			117,380	8,314			117,380	8,314	85,608	7,376
3	CTR 18 MISSILE SIMULATOR	65,067	1,987						0		
4	ROCKET TRAINING 35MM	52,280	1,692						0		
5	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000		4,601		5,704				5,704		7,944
	CARTRIDGES (THOUSANDS)										
6	9MM PARABELLUM	7,362	1,178	15,000	1,650			15,000	1,650	16,300	2,119
7	7.62 MM BLANK, LINKED			2,000	420			2,000	420	18,000	4,680
8	5.56 MM	29,513	4,522	57,706	8,264			57,706	8,264	57,706	10,099
9	20 MM COMBAT			3,225	11,898			3,225	11,898	3,083	13,810
10	20MM TRAINING	450	1,530	10,041	22,291			10,041	22,291	6,156	16,277
11	30 MM TRAINING	8,195	88,625	6,023	59,086			6,023	59,086	7,500	89,700
12	30 MM HEI								0		
13	30 MM API	2,165	30,613	2,364	40,000			2,364	40,000		
14	40MM HEI (GUNSHIP)								0		
15	81 MM			208	20,031			208	20,031		
16	40MM TP GRENADES	2,030	3,533	469	713			469	713	1,547	5,369
17	40MM HE GRENADES	1,435	16,095						0	1,014	10,641
18	CART CHAFF RR 170	5,707	17,823	5,912	19,627			5,912	19,627	1,767	6,078
19	CART CHAFF, RR 136	67	546						0		
20	SIGNAL MK 4 MOD 3	1,258	1,681	1,440	1,454			1,440	1,454	1,999	2,459
21	MXU 4A/A ENGINE STARTER	50	4,972	80	8,341			80	8,341	80	8,799
22	CART IMP 3000 FT/LBS	1,395	3,181	1,586	3,743			1,586	3,743	1,586	4,969
23	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000		8,650		12,428				12,428		17,554
	BOMBS										
24	MK 82 INERT/BDU 50	49,638	13,386	35,000	8,093			35,000	8,093	40,000	11,214
25	DURANDAL	2,659	80,600	3,400	88,131			3,400	88,131	1,200	32,205

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL QTY	FY 86 FINAL AMOUNT	FY 87 REQUEST QTY	FY 87 REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION RECOMMENDATION QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT	FY 88 PROJECTION QTY	FY 88 PROJECTION AMOUNT
26	TIMER ACTUATOR FIN FUZE	4,591	1,963	17,230	4,870			17,230	4,870	17,692	4,066
27	BSU-49 INFLATABLE RETARDER	49,379	31,233	47,987	27,375			47,987	27,375	20,614	14,344
28	BSU-50 INFLATABLE RETARDER	9,300	10,231	7,875	7,574			7,875	7,574	5,695	6,683
29	BOMB 2000 LB HIGH EXPLOSIVE	8,491	31,856	12,017	25,294			12,017	25,294	8,518	21,000
30	BOMB HARD TARGET 2000LB			2,290	37,818			2,290	37,818	2,466	38,306
31	DAACM								0	20	13,100
32	CLUSTER BOMB, MK-20 (ROCKEYE)	1,496	4,397						0		
33	LASER BOMB GUIDANCE KIT								0		
34	GBU-15	495	85,000	696	130,905			696	138,905		
35	BOMB PRACTICE 25 POUND	1100000	20,892	1087752	10,083			1087752	18,083	1100000	23,070
36	BOMB PRACTICE BDU-38	622	5,421						0	844	6,207
37	BOMB, PRACTICE MK-106	120,656	1,303						0		
38	MK-84 BOMB-EMPTY	4,736	6,810		1,770				1,770	2,000	3,778
39	CBU-89(TMD/GATOR)	3,640	172,015	5,390	194,197			5,390	194,197		
40	CBU-87(COMBINED EFFECTS MUNITION)	18,005	400,000	28,050	566,740			28,850	566,748	12,801	272,805
41	BIGEYE				28,400				28,400		115,343
42	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000		1,531		2,516				2,516		5,719
	TARGETS										
43	AERIAL TOW TARGET	361	5,798	609	12,961			609	12,961	987	22,925
44	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000		292		127				127		782
	OTHER ITEMS										
45	FLARE, IR MJU-7B	563,040	13,346	563,253	11,909			563,253	11,909	595,788	13,299
46	FLAFE, PARA, LUU-4B	3,600	1,401						0		
47	FLARE, IR MJU-2	100,022	3,109	156,873	2,823			156,873	2,823	19,520	321
48	MJU-10B			165,000	29,833			165,000	29,833	215,000	36,789
49	M-206 CARTRIDGE FLARE								0		
50	MC-3223 RETARD DEVICE								0		
51	SIGNAL, SMOKE/ILLUM MK-6	20,356	1,959						0		
52	SIGNAL SMOKE AND ILLUMINATING	239,220	2,450						0	144,504	7,495
53	MC-3468, RETARD DEVICE	153	1,878						0		
54	RAPID MUNITIONS ASSEMBLY	49	2,825						0		
55	CHAFF PACKAGE RR 141A/L			111,776	4,850			111,776	4,850		
56	PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENT AMMO								0		
57	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		7,147		4,191				4,191		4,317

106

		FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
LINE NO.	PROGRAM	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
58	MODIFICATIONS		687		200				200		2,480
59	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000		19,034		31,448		2,000		29,448		25,027
	FUZES										
60	FMU 112/FMU 139	45,093	41,725	35,383	36,824			35,383	36,824	51,524	40,65[illegible]
61	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000		184		35				35		1,415
	OTHER WEAPONS										
62	M-203 GRENADE LAUNCHER	1,314	771	921	558			921	558	40	25
63	MACHINE GUN, 7.62MM, M-60	1,259	3,764	97	372			97	372	10	39
64	GAU 5 MACHINE GUN	2,917	1,367						0		
65	40MM MACHINE GUN, MK 19	499	4,221						0		
66	81MM MORTAR			27	392			27	392		
67	9MM HANDGUN	19,000	6,776	24,500	8,656		2,417	24,500	6,239	20,000	7,[illegible]
68	SHOTGUN 12 GAGE			665	278			665	278		
69	NATIONAL RIFLE M14			174	101			174	101		
70	HOST NATION SUPPORT WEAPONS			1,930	3,201			1,930	3,201	700	1,473
	SUBTOTAL, MUNITIONS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIPMENT		1,199,877		1,546,181		4,417		1,541,764		975,114
	VEHICULAR EQUIPMENT										
	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES										
71	SEDAN, 4 DR	293	1,951	396	3,085			396	3,085	371	2,[illegible]
72	STATION WAGON, 4X2	283	2,184	391	3,236			391	3,236	233	1,990
73	BUS, 28 PASSENGER	155	4,707	127	4,000			127	4,000	98	3,171
74	BUS INTERCITY	10	1,604	8	1,307			8	1,307	7	1,177
75	BUS, 44 PASSENGER	81	2,779	45	1,782			45	1,782	63	3,021
76	AMBULANCE, BUS	27	2,150	32	2,681			32	2,681	28	2,376
77	MODULAR AMBULANCE			163	5,902			163	5,902	186	7,054
78	14-20 PASSENGER BUS			10	272			10	272		
79	LAW ENFORCEMENT VEHICLE			335	2,955			335	2,955	384	3,489
	CARGO + UTILITY VEHICLES										
80	TRUCK, STAKE/PLATFORM	540	6,758	555	8,016			555	8,016	464	6,646
81	TRUCK, CARGO-UTILITY, 3/4T, 4X4	336	3,699	275	3,039			275	3,039	385	4,408
82	TRUCK, CARGO-UTILITY, 1/2T, 4X2	486	4,446	306	2,918			306	2,918	309	3,037
83	TRUCK, PICKUP, 1/2T, 4X2	850	6,195	654	4,698			654	4,698	919	6,643

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
84	TRUCK, PICKUP, COMPACT	1,168	6,389	857	4,748			857	4,748	1,010	5,930
85	TRUCK, PICKUP 3/4T 4X4								0		
86	TRUCK MULTI STOP 1 TON 4X2	751	11,147	627	9,360			627	9,360	516	8,290
87	TRUCK, PANEL, 4X2	348	3,251	279	2,798			279	2,798	312	3,113
88	SHOP VAN 4X4	20	869						0		
89	TRUCK CARRYALL	571	7,529	575	7,876			575	7,876	520	7,194
90	COMMERCIAL UTILITY CARGO VEHICLE	258	3,610						0		
91	TRUCK, CARGO, 2 1/2T, 6X6, M 35	361	15,168	388	18,247			388	18,247	300	15,083
92	TRUCK CARGO 5T M 923. M 925	223	17,088	73	6,664			73	6,664	74	7,515
93	SEMI TRAILER, 20 T	34	344						0		
94	TRUCK, CARGO, 2 1/2T			58	1,639			58	1,639	135	4,000
95	HIGH MOBILITY VEHICLE (MYP)	578	15,290	400	10,713			400	10,713	400	11,134
96	TRUCK, TRACTOR, 5T			43	1,553			43	1,553	100	3,716
97	TRUCK TRACTOR 5T M 932 (MYP)	15	978	6	412			6	412	43	3,048
98	TRUCK TRACTOR, OVER 5T	105	4,624	114	5,484			114	5,484	147	8,017
99	TRUCK WRECKER	7	369						0		
100	TRUCK WRECKER 5T M936 (MYP)	24	3,616	15	2,423			15	2,423	9	1,495
101	TRUCK, DUMP 5 TON	183	8,149	220	10,930			220	10,930	165	6,459
102	TRUCK, UTILITY	218	2,091						0		
103	VAN MISSILE MAINT								0		
104	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000		8,058		20,565				20,565		17,554
	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES										
105	TRUCK MAINT 4X2	287	2,453	295	3,073			295	3,073	147	1,763
106	TRUCK, MAINT, 4X4	101	998						0		
107	TRUCK, MAINT, HI REACH	26	1,898	17	1,888			17	1,888	19	2,304
108	TRUCK, TELEPHONE MAINTENANCE	26	3,763	18	2,685			18	2,685	10	1,599
109	TRUCK, TANK, 1200 GAL	56	1,961	50	2,135			50	2,135	42	1,820
110	TRUCK TANK FULL R 9								0	351	38,932
111	TRUCK, TANK, FUEL, M 49	31	1,786	35	2,487			35	2,487	42	3,070
112	TRUCK, TANK, LIQ NIT, C 5	2	467						0		
113	TRACTOR A/C TOW U 30								0		
114	TRACTOR, A/C TOW, MB 2								0	67	3,858
115	TRACTOR, A/C TOW, MB 4	110	2,675	167	4,135			167	4,135	102	2,598
116	TRACTOR, TOW, FLIGHTLINE	260	3,853	370	5,487			370	5,487	205	3,130

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		[illegible] RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
117	TRACTOR, WHEELED, INDUSTRIAL	150	1,915						0		
118	TRACTOR, DOZER	37	2,443	83	5,538			83	5,538	121	8,188
119	VEHICLE,LAW ENFORCEMENT	271	2,342						0		
120	TRUCK, DEMINERAL WATER, 2600 GAL	9	942	23	2,473			23	2,473	22	2,435
121	TRUCK HI LIFT C5	2	119						0		
122	TRUCK HI LIFT 3T	3	186						0		
123	TRUCK, HI LIFT, 9T	3	182						0		
124	TRUCK REFUSE	23	1,793						0		
125	TRANSPORTABLE MAINT UNIT								0	4	2,509
126	TRUCK HYDRANT FUEL	39	2,919						0		
127	TRAILER WATER M149	19	128						0		
128	TRAILER FUEL A1B	7	68						0		
129	SEMI TRAILER COMPRESSED GAS	16	2,725	11	2,731			11	2,731	10	2,555
130	SEMI TRAILER TANK UDMH	1	137						0		
131	DOLLY M720								0		
132	DOLLY M832	19	427						0		
133	MOBILE ARM RECON VEHICLE								0	22	17,158
134	POLYMER PLACEMENT TRUCK								0	28	10,639
135	RESIN TANK TRUCK								0	47	4,969
136	SCAB VEHICLE REPAIR								0	31	1,630
137	M-113 ARM PERS CARRIER								0	3	628
138	TRACTOR WHEELED W DOZER								0		
139	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000		7,530		15,369				15,369		26,753
	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT										
140	TRUCK CRASH P-4/P-19	140	23,744						0		
141	TRUCK CRASH P-15	5	3,494	3	2,248			3	2,248		
142	TRUCK CRASH P-2	18	8,201						0	58	27,693
143	TRUCK WATER P-18	52	3,866	79	6,088			79	6,088	15	1,190
144	TRUCK,PUMPER, P-8	16	1,852	28	3,242			28	3,242	31	3,696
145	TRUCK, PUMPER, P-12	2	186	18	1,700			18	1,700	30	2,917
146	TRUCK CRASH P-10	14	406						0		
147	TRUCK CRASH P-13/P-20	20	494						0		
148	TRUCK FIRE HI-REACH								0		
149	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000		839		4,015				4,015		3,702

109

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT										
150	TRUCK F/L 4,000 LB GED/DED 144"	151	2,143	215	3,295			215	3,295	181	2,868
151	TRUCK, F/L 6000 LB	203	4,934	183	6,529			183	6,529	178	3,156
152	TRUCK, F/L 10,000 LB	196	8,279	216	9,413			216	9,413	152	6,865
153	TRUCK F/L LARGE CAPACITY AT	10	627						0		
154	TRUCK, F/L 15000 LB	19	715						0		
155	LARGE CAPACITY LOADER			10	4,328			10	4,328		
156	25K A/C LOADER			46	4,224			46	4,224		
157	TACTICAL CARGO LOADER								0	15	9,462
158	TRACTOR, WHSE, 4,000 LB	101	849						0		
159	CONTAINER, LIFT, TRUCK	20	4,453	43	9,833			43	9,833		
160	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000		2,658		10,532				10,532		7,915
	BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT										
161	LOADER, SCOOP	54	3,601	102	7,042			102	7,042	130	8,524
162	LOADER, SCOOP, W/BACKHOE	20	699						0		
163	DISTRIBUTOR, WATER 1500 GALLON	49	2,457	56	2,855			56	2,855	19	998
164	PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENT VEHICLES								0		
165	CLEANER, RUNWAY/STREET	101	5,850	191	18,038			191	18,038	111	12,709
166	ROLLER, VIBRATING	31	611						0		
167	TRUCK DUMP 22T	9	860						0		
168	GRADER, ROAD, MOTORIZED	54	3,110	36	2,154			36	2,154	38	2,288
169	CRANE, 7 50 TON	23	3,133	118	12,072			118	12,072	46	7,078
170	EXCAVATOR, DED, PT	38	4,305	38	5,045			38	5,045	64	8,751
171	WATERCRAFT	3	4,295	8	4,055			8	4,055	2	2,991
172	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		4,512		6,492				6,492		9,734
173	MODIFICATIONS		197		295				295		487
174	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000		14,611		12,997				12,997		8,094
	SUBTOTAL, VEHICULAR EQUIPMENT		304,824		331,796		0		331,796		416,195
	ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIP										
	COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT(COMSEC)										
175	SPACE SYSTEMS (COMSEC)		33,497		10,002				10,002		12,452
176	TEMPEST EQUIPMENT		546		612				612		606

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
177	TAC SECURE VOICE		13,201		10,802				10,802		12,157
178	DCS SECURE VOICE (COMSEC)		20,185		13,338				13,338		26,890
179	SECURE DATA		42,228		35,141				35,141		41,980
180	TRI TAC (COMSEC)		28,921		46,082				46,082		15,725
181	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		7,563		11,876				11,876		10,423
182	MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC)		282		330				330		328
	INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS										
183	INTELLIGENCE DATA HANDLING SYS		24,727		31,817				31,817		22,635
184	INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT		6,201		12,641				12,641		12,914
185	INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIP		4,585		11,000				11,000		1,004
186	COBRA JUDY				248				248		247
187	COBRA SHOE		2,973		3,084				3,084		3,173
188	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000		6,375		17,545				17,545		37,697
	ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS										
189	TRAFFIC CONTROL/LANDING		4,981		11,899				11,899		19,574
190	TACTICAL AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVE		84,408		64,316				64,316		172,991
191	WEATHER OBSERV/FORCAST		27,468		61,494				61,494		68,140
192	DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM		117,825		100,093				100,093		37,953
193	OTH B RADAR		173,036		188,157				188,157		257,926
194	SACDIN		1,129						0		
195	SAC COMMAND AND CONTROL		11,123		11,265				11,265		17,165
196	LAUNCH CONTROL CENTER COMMUNICATIONS				9,415				9,415		8,913
197	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX		54,136		10,770				10,770		29,652
198	PAVE PAWS/SLBM WARNING SYSTEMS		9,025		120,206				120,206		995
199	BMEWS MODERNIZATION		70,754		41,032				41,032		1,608
200	SPACETRACK		10,068		4,888				4,888		1,020
201	NAVSTAR GPS		3,351		12,356				12,356		23,657
202	USAFE COMMAND/CONTROL SYSTEM		8,700		12,144				12,144		2,515
203	PACAF COMMAND/CONTROL		9,897		1,153				1,153		
204	DEFENSE METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG		9,998		3,442				3,442		11,358
205	CARIBBEAN BASIN RADAR NETWORK		4,400		11,272				11,272		13,271
206	MARS/USAF FAA RADAR UPGRADE		2,798		16,194				16,194		36,991
207	TAC SIGINT SUPPORT		34,671		15,755				15,755		24,004
208	DIST ERLY WARNING RDR/NORTH WARNING		8,858		4,318				4,318		5,038

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
209	TACTICAL GROUND INTERCEPT FACILITY		17,464		5,155				5,155		7,583
210	TR-1 GROUND STATIONS		10,103						0		43,724
211	AIR BASE SURVIVABILITY		1,567		3,085				3,085		9,540
212	CMDR'S TACTICAL TERMINALS(CTT)/TEREC		4,056		2,805				2,805		4,423
213	IMAGERY TRANS		19,960		12,349				12,349		9,717
214	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM (NDS)								0		12,264
215	TACTICAL WARNING SYSTEMS SUPPORT		390		3,435				3,435		7,762
216	NORTH ATLANTIC DEFENSE C3		22,362		26,643				26,643		29,755
	SPECIAL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS										
217	AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING EQUIP		162,261		135,569				135,569		146,720
218	WWMCCS/WIS ADPE		38,220		40,092		-20,000		20,092		51,339
219	MAC COMMAND AND CONTROL SUPPORT		17,120		53,197				53,197		44,193
220	GLCM COMMUNICATIONS		14,471		5,983				5,983		3,919
221	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM		52,508		7,154				7,154		27,391
222	WEAPONS STORAGE/SECURITY		2,944		20,535				20,535		25,993
223	RANGE IMPROVEMENTS		90,173		143,078				143,078		174,075
224	RADAR BOMB SCORER		9,100		12,837				12,837		
225	PLSS		20,623		27,231		-27,231		0		2,047
226	C3 COUNTERMEASURES		21,308		8,146				8,146		4,312
227	JOINT SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM				9,410				9,410		443
228	SPACE SHUTTLE		4,978		7,756				7,756		7,582
229	BASE LEVEL DATA AUTO PROGRAM		47,904		99,221				99,221		41,825
230	SATELLITE CONTROL FACILITY		66,262		126,614				126,614		136,201
231	JTIDS								0		
232	CONSTANT WATCH		15,924		4,286				4,286		4,583
233	CONSOLIDATED SPACE OPS CENTER		17,613		75,988				75,988		24,067
234	CMD CENTER PROCESSING/DISPLAY SYS		2,552		2,110				2,110		24,282
235	HAMMER ACE		831		1,703				1,703		4,417
236	SAMTO TEST RANGES I&M		22,144		66,928				66,928		61,601
237	EMP HARDENING		12,685		15,786				15,786		
	AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS										
238	PROGRAM 698AJ		1,965		1,927				1,927		1,913
239	INFORMATION TRANSMISSION SYSTEMS		5,748		8,038				8,038		8,603
240	TELEPHONE EXCHANGE		52,926		76,590				76,590		52,657

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
241	JOINT TACTICAL COMM PROGRAM		160,227		234,093				234,093		216,705
242	USREDCOM		2,971		13,417				13,417		9,211
243	USCENTCOM		26,063		26,427				26,427		25,250
244	AFSATCOMM								0		
245	AUTOMATED TELECOMMUNICATIONS PRG		18,826		23,792				23,792		12,537
246	CINC MOBILE COMMAND CENTER				30,260				30,260		8,594
247	MILSTAR				50,614		-50,614		0		
248	TELETYPEWRITER EQUIPMENT		11,724						0		
249	SATELLITE TERMINALS		65,071		10,977				10,977		37,376
	DCA PROGRAMS										
250	WIDEBAND SYSTEMS UPGRADE		45,708		68,740				68,740		51,738
251	TECH CONTROL EXPANSION								0		
252	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMER COMM NET		14,385		97,187				97,187		9,658
253	DCS SECURE VOICE EQUIPMENT		18,380		37,762				37,762		4,556
	ORGANIZATION AND BASE										
254	TACTICAL C E EQUIPMENT		17,946		66,376				66,376		59,130
255	PRODUCTIVITY INV TELECOM		16,431		3,939				3,939		
256	RADIO EQUIPMENT		38,609		58,307				58,307		51,537
257	PRODUCTIVITY ENH TELECOMM				4,572				4,572		
258	FIBER OPTICS		1,430		3,318				3,318		4,165
259	TV EQUIPMENT (AFRTV)		4,493		4,920				4,920		5,006
260	CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT		4,657		7,556				7,556		5,780
261	C3 REPLACEMENT PROGRAM								0		
262	E + I REQUIREMENTS		10,795		1,822				1,822		7,387
263	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		350,662		423,269				423,269		407,878
264	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000		15,468		20,690				20,690		29,067
	MODIFICATIONS										
265	COMM ELECTRONICS CLASS IV		36,179		39,990				39,990		45,037
266	TRAFFIC CONTROL/LANDING		3,418						0		
267	ORGANIZATION AND BASE								0		
268	BMEWS (474L)								0		

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
269	TACTICAL EQUIPMENT		25,393		21,398				21,398		30,305
270	ANTIJAM VOICE		10,909		23,758				23,758		14,498
	SUBTOTAL, ELECTRONICS & TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIP		2,493,905		3,183,122		-97,845		3,085,277		2,940,148
	OTHER BASE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT EQUIP										
	TEST EQUIPMENT										
271	BASE/ALC CALIBRATION PACKAGE		45,027		54,464				54,464		54,816
272	NEWARK AFS CALIBRATION PACKAGE		3,359		2,851				2,851		4,170
273	TEST EQUIPMENT-GEN PURP		28,772		12,456				12,456		8,869
274	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000		35,585		49,841				49,841		44,155
	PERSONAL SAFETY AND RESCUE EQUIP										
275	LIFE RAFT, 20 MAN	652	989						0		
276	AUTOMATIC LIFE PERSERVER	3,000	2,981	5,355	5,396			5,355	5,396	2,425	2,515
277	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES	683	7,338	1,098	8,763			1,098	8,763	1,332	11,486
278	BREATHING APPARATUS TWO HOUR								0	2,697	3,976
279	CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEF PROG		72,620		114,599				114,599		158,887
280	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000		6,966		9,824				9,824		10,653
	DEPOT PLANT + MATERIALS HANDLING EQ										
281	BASE MECHANIZATION EQUIPMENT		37,099		34,731				34,731		56,450
282	AIR TERMINAL MECHANIZATION EQUIP		1,215		3,153				3,153		10,801
283	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000		13,493		16,085				16,085		21,629
	ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT										
284	GENERATORS MOBILE ELECTRIC		27,892		26,709				26,709		26,340
285	FLOOD LIGHTS	656	7,745	926	11,282		-8,865	926	2,417	955	11,715
286	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000		479		4,155				4,155		10,246
	BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
287	BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT				59,793				59,793		68,824
288	MEDICAL/DENTAL EQUIPMENT		120,039		143,916		-2,000		141,916		121,125
289	AIR BASE SURVIVABILITY		19,700		22,855				22,855		26,011
290	COB ESSENTIAL FACILITIES		5,229		4,060				4,060		4,260
291	BARRIER, AIRCRAFT ARRESTING SYSTEM	2	157						0		
292	PALLET, AIR CARGO, 108"X88"	3,000	2,670	2,077	2,089			2,077	2,089	2,000	1,969
293	NET ASSEMBLY, 108"X88"		3,306		4,501				4,501		597
294	PUMPS AND COMPRESSORS		1,282						0		

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION				FY 88 PROJECTION	
						CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION			
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
295	MOBILITY CONTAINERS	341	2,425						0		
296	BLADDERS FUEL	184	2,260	200	2,498			200	2,498	200	2,574
297	TACTICAL SHELTER	72	16,822	59	25,879		-2,718	59	23,161	48	7,522
298	PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT		6,486		6,526				6,526		4,963
299	PRODUCTIVITY ENHANCEMENT				10,390		-1,000		9,390		10,918
300	PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENTS		928		2,126				2,126		
301	ANTI TERRORISM EQUIPMENT								0		4,874
302	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT		43,068		60,977				60,977		68,861
303	WARTIME HOST NATION SUPPORT		5,069		8,197				8,197		8,312
304	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		13,295		13,915		-2,000		11,915		17,540
305	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000		15,032		16,246				16,246		22,132
	SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS										
306	INTELLIGENCE PRODUCTION ACTIVITY		19,124		22,739				22,739		22,722
307	SCIENTIFIC/TECHNICAL INTELLIGENCE		4,258		10,130				10,130		7,676
308	TECH SURV COUNTERMEASURES EQ		4,939		7,757				7,757		2,118
309	DEFENSE DISSEMINATION SYSTEM		12,571		8,335				8,335		6,898
310	AF TECHNICAL APPLICATION CENTER		15,849		13,634				13,634		18,309
311	PHOTO PROC/INTERPRET SYS		10,001		1,470				1,470		1,267
312	SELECTED ACTIVITIES		3,800,211		4,115,736				4,115,736		4,338,783
313	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM		84,664		871,847				871,847		285,790
314	INDUSTRIAL SURGE				19,200		-2,000		17,200		
315	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS		2,497		2,071				2,071		2,231
316	MISC EQUIPMENT		6,266		19,589		-2,000		17,589		18,914
317	MODIFICATIONS		5,069		8,416		-1,000		7,416		11,006
	NON CENTRALLY MANAGED ITEMS										
318	NON CENTRALLY MANAGED ITEMS		54,700						0		
	SUBTOTAL, OTHER BASE MAINTENANCE & SUPPORT EQUIP		4,569,477		5,839,201		-21,583		5,817,618		5,523,204
	UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION		---		--		-335,900		-335,900		---
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS				---		-65,707		-65,707		---
	TOTAL, AIR FORCE OTHER PROCUREMENT		8,568,083		10,900,300		-525,452		10,374,848		9,854,661

PREPAREDNESS SUBCOMMITTEE PROGRAMS

In the funding line items under the oversight of the Preparedness Subcommittee, the administration requested $1,661.5 million for fiscal year 1987. This amount represents growth of 25 percent over the fiscal year 1986 appropriated level for these programs. The reason these accounts reflect significant real growth is that the Air Force is attempting to reduce its large shortfalls in ammunition and weapons. The committee fully supports this request and recommends a reduction of $26.0 million to this group of accounts. The committee recommends that no funding reductions be applied against the ammunition accounts.

Except for the $26.0 million reductions to the ten programs, the committee recommends fully funding remaining items. No undistributed reduction will apply to these programs.

30MM GAU-8 AMMUNITION

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated in this bill for 30 millimeter GAU-8 ammunition may be expended until such time as the requirement for depleted uranium penetrators is broken out as a separate procurement item.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE AGENCIES

(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL QTY	FY 86 FINAL AMOUNT	FY 87 REQUEST QTY	FY 87 REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION RECOMMENDATION QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT	FY 88 PROJECTION QTY	FY 88 PROJECTION AMOUNT
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD										
1	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD/WHS		62,651		111,289		-6,000		105,289		132,612
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA										
2	CLASSIFIED EQUIPMENT		[ ]		[ ]				[ ]		[ ]
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DNA										
3	VEHICLES		237		232				232		249
4	OTHER CAPITAL EQUIPMENT		5,663		4,298				4,298		5,144
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCA										
5	WWMCCS ADP SYSTEMS		14,978		14,887				14,887		16,231
6	DEFENSE SWITCHING NETWORK		10,831						0		
7	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000 EACH		43,476		40,169				40,169		32,956
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DIA										
8	INTELLIGENCE & COMMUNICATIONS		[ ]		[ ]				[ ]		[ ]
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DLA										
9	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT		9,666		8,642				8,642		8,503
10	VEHICLES		1,869		1,387				1,387		983
11	MECHANIZED MATERIALS HANDLING SYS		14,620		24,723				24,723		61,524
12	ADP EQUIPMENT		26,449		60,026				60,026		90,453
13	TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT		10,982		17,289				17,289		17,410
14	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT		10,605		10,023				10,023		6,780
15	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000 EACH		5,950		2,900				2,900		3,200
16	AUTOMATED MARKING/READING SYSTEM(LOGMARS)		220		500				500		100
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DMA										
17	ADP EQUIPMENT		19,967						0		
18	VEHICLES		342		368				368		253
19	OTHER CAPITAL EQUIPMENT		29,278		30,120				30,120		13,764
20	AF PHASE IV COMPUTER		1,800						0		
21	2 COLOR OFFSET PRINTING PRESS								0	1	952
22	DIRECT PRINTING SYSTEM								0		1,020

						COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION					
		FY 86 FINAL		FY 87 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION	
LINE NO.	PROGRAM	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
23	RASTER SCAN EDIT STATION				1,746				1,746		
24	PASS REPLACEMENT		2,558						0		
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DIS										
25	VEHICLES		5,686		1,789				1,789		3,217
26	OTHER CAPITAL EQUIPMENT		1,380		1,849				1,849		195
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, USUHS										
27	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000 EACH		743		1,295				1,295		2,197
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCAA										
28	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000 EACH		7,588		8,064				8,064		2,745
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DAVA										
29	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000 EACH								0		
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DRSP										
30	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000 EACH		338,200		402,800				402,800		[ ]
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DIG										
31	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000 EACH		2,145		1,700				1,700		980
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		659,856		742,304				742,304		1,140,400
	UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION		--		--		-62,900		-62,900		
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		--		[ ]		58,000		58,000		
	TOTAL, DEFENSE AGENCIES PROCUREMENT		1,287,740		1,488,400		-10,900		1,477,500		1,541,868

MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD/WHS

The administration requested $111.3 million for major equipment, OSD/WHS for fiscal year 1987. A reduction of $6.0 million is recommended by the committee. The committee recommends that no additional reduction be applied to this program.

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT, DEFENSE

(BUDGET AUTHORITY IN THOUSANDS)

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL QTY	FY 86 FINAL AMOUNT	FY 87 REQUEST QTY	FY 87 REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION RECOMMENDATION QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT	FY 88 PROJECTION QTY	FY 88 PROJECTION AMOUNT
	RESERVE EQUIPMENT										
1	RESERVE, ARMY		365,000		0		90,000		90,000		0
	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT						90,000		90,000		
2	RESERVE, NAVY		100,000		0		45,000		45,000		0
	HCS (HH-60) MODIFICATIONS						30,000		30,000		
	SEABEES						15,000		15,000		
3	RESERVE, MARINE CORPS		70,000		0		20,000		20,000		0
	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT						20,000		20,000		
4	RESERVE, AIR FORCE		180,000		0		150,000		150,000		0
	C-130 AIRCRAFT					8	150,000		150,000		
	SUBTOTAL, RESERVE EQUIPMENT		715,000		0		305,000		305,000		0

LINE NO.	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL QTY	FY 86 FINAL AMOUNT	FY 87 REQUEST QTY	FY 87 REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: RECOMMENDATION QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT	FY 88 PROJECTION QTY	FY 88 PROJECTION AMOUNT
	NATIONAL GUARD EQUIPMENT										
5	GUARD, ARMY		531,800		0		140,000		140,000		0
	UH-60 BLACKHAWK					5	30,000		30,000		
	5-TON TRUCK					250	22,500		22,500		
	M-113					76	20,000		20,000		
	AN/PRC-104A					754	10,200		10,200		
	AN/GRC-193A					310	9,900		9,900		
	AN/GRC-213					184	3,400		3,400		
	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT						44,000		44,000		
6	GUARD, AIR FORCE		255,000		0		20,000		20,000		0
	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT						20,000		20,000		
	SUB-TOTAL, NATIONAL GUARD EQUIPMENT		786,800		0		160,000		160,000		0
	TOTAL, NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT		1,501,800		0		465,000		465,000		0

The committee recommends a continuation of funding for the everyday equipment needs of Guard and Reserve units to offset existing equipment shortfalls. Based on testimony from the Guard and Reserve component commanders identifying high priority, combat essential equipment shortages, the committee recommends an additional $500.00 million ($465.0 million in National Guard and Reserve procurement and $35.0 million in Air Force research, development, test and evaluation) be authorized in the following amounts:

Army National Guard—$30.0 million (for 5 UH-60 Blackhawks), $22.5 million (for 250 5-ton trucks), $20.0 million (for 76 M-113 vehicles), $10.2 million (for 754 AN/PRC-104A's), $9.9 million (for 310 AN/GRC-193A's), $3.4 million (for 187 AN/GRC-213's), and $44.0 million (for miscellaneous equipment as identified to the committee by the Chief of the Army National Guard).

Air National Guard—$35.0 million (for research, development, test and evaluation funds for the A-7 Strikefighter) and $20.0 million (for miscellaneous equipment as identified to the committee by the Chief of the Air National Guard).

Army Reserves—$90.0 million (for miscellaneous equipment as identified to the committee by the Chief of the Army Reserves).

Navy Reserves—$30.0 million (for HH-60 mods), and $15.0 million (for the Seabees).

Air Force Reserves—$150.0 million (for 8 C-130 aircraft).

USMC Reserves—$20.0 million (for miscellaneous equipment as identified to the committee by the Chief of the USMC Reserves).

The $35.0 million for research and evaluation of the A-7 Strikefighter is included in the Air Force research, development, test and evaluation section of this report.

The committee directs that the Chief of each Guard and Reserve component provide to the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services a detailed report on the items to be procured with such funds within 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

DOD CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION PROGRAM

(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

LINE NO	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL QTY	FY 86 FINAL AMOUNT	FY 87 REQUEST QTY	FY 87 REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION RECOMMENDATION QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT	FY 88 PROJECTION QTY	FY 88 PROJECTION AMOUNT
1	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION RDT&E		0		9,800				9,800		11,500
2	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION PROCUREMENT		0		49,800				49,800		50,000
3	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION O&M		0		60,500				60,500		74,856
	TOTAL, DOD CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION		0		120,100		0		120,100		136,356

The administration requested $120.1 million for the demilitarization of existing chemical weapons in fiscal year 1987. This is a new account for fiscal year 1987. The committee recommends full funding for chemical demilitarization and no undistributed reduction be applied to this account. (See further discussion under the Chemical Deterrent Program, in the Army Ammunition procurement account.)

AUTHORIZATION FOR MULTIYEAR CONTRACTS

The administration requested authority to enter multiyear contracts for the procurement of seven systems. The following is a list of programs proposed for multiyear contracts and the projected savings when compared with annual contracts:

PROJECTED SAVINGS

System	Percent Savings
UH-60A Blackhawk and EH-60A Quick Fix Airframe	11.0
Patriot Weapon System	10.0
Stinger Weapon System	10.4
F/A-18 Aircraft	10.0
MK-45 Gun Mount and MK-6 Ammunition Hoist	21.9
Defense Support Program	19.9
HARM Weapon System	2.8

The committee has consistently supported multiyear contracting as a means to achieve program savings and stability. The experience thus far with multiyear programs has been favorable. In virtually every program that has been approved for multiyear funding, substantial savings over annual contract costs have been realized and program stability has been dramatically increased. The success of these efforts stands in sharp contrast to the rampant cost growth and program turmoil that characterized many Defense Department programs during the late 1970s.

The committee notes that when the administration first proposed multiyear contracting, savings were estimated between 10 and 20 percent. The committee has previously indicated that it considers 10 percent to be a minimum acceptable level.

In view of the success of previous multiyear contracts, the committee recommends approval of the administration's request to enter multiyear obligations for the UH-60/EH-60 airframe, the Patriot Weapon System, and the Defense Support Program. The committee recommends disapproval of the F/A-18 aircraft and the MK-45 Gun Mount and MK-6 Ammunition Hoist multiyear requests. Additionally, the committee recommends approval of the Stinger Weapon system, subject to the conditions stated in Title I (Procurement, Army), and the HARM missile, provided the multiyear savings meets the 10.0 percent savings criterion. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to certify the multiyear savings of the HARM missile to be 10.0 percent or greater prior to executing multiyear funds.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

BACKGROUND ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AUTHORIZATION

Annual authorization of appropriations for all research, development, test and evaluation conducted by the Department of Defense has been required by law since 1963 (Public Law 88–174). Appropriate subcommittees of the full committee conducted hearings and reviewed information on various research and development program requests including, but not limited to, the following: Army general purpose programs; the MX program and ballistic missile defense; the Strategic Defense Initiative; tactical and strategic aircraft and associated systems; Army anti-tank weapons and electronic warfare; the Trident and various other submarine programs; new ships and related ship programs; lasers and particle beam technology; strategic command, control and communications (C3); chemical warfare matters; and various land, air, and sea-launched cruise missile systems. The committee recommendations appear in the following pages.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED FUNDING CHANGES

The table below gives a comparison of the amounts provided for research, development, test and evaluation for fiscal year 1986 with the amounts requested for authorization in the President's budget for fiscal year 1987 and those recommended by the committee.

SUMMARY OF ADJUSTMENTS TO
FISCAL YEAR 1987 RDT&E AUTHORIZATION REQUEST

(Dollars amounts in thousands; totals may not add due to rounding)

	FY 86 FINAL	FY 87 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
Army	4,841,472	5,550,300	-610,831	4,939,469
Navy/Marine Corps	10,076,939	10,586,800	-1,095,822	9,490,978
Air Force	13,787,408	17,275,400	-1,973,727	15,301,673
Defense Agencies	6,642,386	8,364,300	-1,010,326	7,353,974
Director, Test and Evaluation	118,500	141,800	0	141,800
Director, Oper Test and Evaluation	0	11,300	0	11,300
TOTAL, RDT&E	35,466,705	41,929,900	-4,690,706	37,239,194

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY

(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL AMOUNT	FY 87 REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT	FY 88 PROJECTION AMOUNT
1	61101A	IN-HOUSE LAB INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	25,105	19,020		19,020	20,277
2	61102A	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	233,544	212,594		212,594	219,548
3	61103A	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	6,052	12,380		12,380	24,606
4	62105A	MATERIALS	12,481	16,346		16,346	18,920
5	62111A	ATMOSPHERIC INVESTIGATIONS	5,498	11,563	5,000	6,563	13,686
6	62120A	NUCLEAR WEAPONS EFFECTS/FLUIDICS	22,488	47,797		47,797	54,152
7	62122A	SURVIVABILITY ENHANCEMENTS	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
8	62201A	AIRCRAFT WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	3,307	1,416		1,416	1,724
9	62202A	AIRCRAFT AVIONICS TECHNOLOGY	9,083	11,102		11,102	12,083
10	62209A	AERONAUTICAL TECHNOLOGY	27,451	34,814		34,814	43,629
11	62210A	AIRDROP TECHNOLOGY	2,053	2,900		2,900	3,094
12	62303A	MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	28,649	24,587		24,587	30,530
13	62307A	LASER WEAPON TECHNOLOGY	11,133	11,228		11,228	14,195
14	62601A	TANK AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY	22,128	25,711		25,711	29,452
15	62603A	LARGE CALIBER AND NUCLEAR TECHNOLOGY	22,442	0		0	0
16	62617A	SMALL CAL AND FIRE CNTRL TECHNOLOGY	11,561	0		0	0
17	62618A	BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY	43,413	46,155		46,155	48,288
18	62622A	CHEMICAL AND SMOKE MUNITIONS	14,083	23,228		23,228	26,242
19	62623A	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	5,493	11,119		11,119	11,163
20	62624A	WEAPONS & MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	0	28,663	-10,000	18,663	27,235
21	62701A	TACTICAL TELEPROCESSING TECHNOLOGY	17,213	26,894		26,894	29,260
22	62703A	COMBAT SURVEILL TARGET ACQUIS & IDENT	4,516	7,766		7,766	8,021
23	62704A	MIL ENVIRONMENTAL CRITERIA DEV	3,067	3,413		3,413	3,932
24	62705A	ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES	21,558	24,039		24,039	26,414
25	62706A	CHEM BIOLOGICAL DEF / GEN INVEST	39,568	39,656		39,656	44,310
26	62707A	MAPPING GEODESY	9,000	9,678		9,678	10,815
27	62709A	NIGHT VISION INVESTIGATIONS	20,840	28,056		28,056	29,890
28	62715A	TACTICAL ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]

					COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION		
LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL AMOUNT	FY 87 REQUEST AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT	FY 88 PROJECTION AMOUNT
29	62716A	HUMAN FACTORS ENG SYS DEV	13,993	17,811		17,811	20,127
30	62717A	HUMAN PERFORMANCE EFFECT/SIMULATION	5,228	13,113		13,113	14,760
31	62719A	MOBILITY AND WEAPONS EFFECTS TECH	12,265	14,879		14,879	15,929
32	62720A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECH	8,930	8,760		8,760	9,213
33	62722A	MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING	7,533	4,730		4,730	4,703
34	62723A	CLOTHING EQUIP AND SHELTER TECH	8,996	18,012	-7,000	11,012	17,059
35	62724A	JT SVC FOOD SYS TECH	5,960	5,162		5,162	5,915
36	62725A	COMPUTER AND INFORMATION SCIENCE	2,198	2,574		2,574	2,581
37	62727A	NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES	5,042	4,397		4,397	6,874
38	62730A	COLD REGIONS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	6,990	4,308		4,308	5,025
39	62731A	MILITARY FACILITIES ENGINEERING TECHNOLO	5,345	5,764		5,764	6,208
40	62733A	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT TECHNOLOGY	13,708	15,914		15,914	17,848
41	62734A	MED DEFENSE AGAINST CHEM AGENTS	31,101	34,613		34,613	39,889
42	62746A	TACTICAL SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY	6,433	10,794		10,794	15,331
43	62770A	MILITARY DISEASE HAZARDS TECH	27,372	48,677	-16,000	32,677	51,489
44	62772A	COMBAT CASUALTY CARE TECH	8,913	10,376		10,376	10,439
45	62775A	COMBAT MAXILLOFACIAL INJURY	2,166	2,813		2,813	3,714
46	62777A	SYSTEMS HEALTH HAZARD PREVENT TECH	19,428	22,223		22,223	23,130
47	62781A	ENERGY TECH APPL FOR MILITARY FACIL	2,259	2,035		2,035	2,295
		CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	15,611	18,837		18,837	21,090
		SUBTOTAL, TECHNOLOGY BASE	831,197	945,917	-38,000	907,917	1,045,085
48	63102A	MATERIELS AND STRUCTURES	14,289	20,154		20,154	17,772
49	63104A	FUELS AND LUBRICANTS	3,358	3,527		3,527	4,186
50	63105A	ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME RESE	39,516	0		0	0
51	63201A	AIRCRAFT POWER PLANTS AND PROPULSION	19,602	20,365		20,365	26,145
52	63206A	AIRCRAFT WEAPONS	6,877	10,349		10,349	10,257
53	63207A	AIRCRAFT AVIONICS EQUIPMENT	10,838	4,408		4,408	8,754
54	63209A	AIR MOBILITY SUPPORT	0	0		0	0
55	63211A	ROTARY WING CONTROLS/ROTORS/STRUCTURES	16,979	23,560		23,560	27,065
56	63216A	SYNTHETIC FLIGHT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	12,462	11,126		11,126	11,581
57	63218A	AIRDROP ADVANCEMENT	3,819	4,547		4,547	3,628
58	63221A	NOE AVIATION AND NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT	3,052	2,370		2,370	5,019

LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL	FY 87 REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION
					CHANGE FROM REQUEST	RECOMMENDATION	
			AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT
59	63255A	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	0	2,637	-2,637	0	4,370
60	63306A	TERMINALLY GUIDED PROJECTILES	14,394	27,939		27,939	50,690
61	63313A	MSL/ROCKET COMPONENTS	18,685	37,881		37,881	33,647
62	63322A	BATTLEFIELD ENVIRONMENT SIMULATION	988	7,083	-3,000	4,083	8,508
63	63324A	ARMY DEVELOPMENT AND EMPLOYMENT ACTIVITY	9,588	11,411		11,411	15,393
64	63602A	ADVANCED LAND MOB SYSTEMS CONCEPTS	16,286	10,890		10,890	19,886
65	63606A	LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER DEV	11,184	11,344		11,344	13,353
66	63607A	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	3,474	9,480		9,480	7,029
67	63621A	COMBAT VEHICLE PROPULSION SYS	11,864	9,766		9,766	13,791
68	63631A	CMBT VEH TURRET AND CHASSIS SUBSYS	16,912	18,895		18,895	22,997
69	63634A	COMBAT VEHICLE ARMOR/ANTI ARMOR	11,241	9,411		9,411	11,229
70	63637A	ADV PROPULSION/LAUNCH SYS FOR MUN	8,134	5,887		5,887	9,831
71	63638A	NUCLEAR VULNERABILITY ADV TECHNOLOGY	0	6,614	-6,614	0	6,451
72	63640A	AMMUNITION LOGISTICS	1,482	2,170		2,170	5,415
73	63710A	NIGHT VISION ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	31,495	29,080		29,080	36,813
74	63719A	SPECIAL PURPOSE DETECTORS	0	2,961	-2,961	0	3,939
75	63723A	TACTICAL C4 TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION	24,357	13,335		13,335	14,567
76	63725A	REMOTELY PILOTED VEHICLES/DRONES	0	0		0	0
77	63727A	SPACE TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION	0	987		987	985
78	63731A	MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL	13,882	14,204		14,204	16,323
79	63734A	ENGINEERING SYSTEMS	1,927	5,393		5,393	6,450
80	63736A	HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING APPLICATIONS	0	2,458	-2,458	0	2,974
81	63737A	ANTI RADIATION MISSILE COUNTERMEASURES	4,890	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
82	63739A	HUMAN FACTORS IN TNG/OPER EFFECT	8,974	9,191		9,191	10,377
83	63742A	ADV ELECTRONIC DEVICES DEV	9,635	5,537		5,537	5,141
84	63743A	EDUCATION AND TRAINING	11,787	7,033		7,033	9,028
85	63744A	TRAINING SIMULATION	5,459	6,618		6,618	7,667
86	63748A	TEST MEASUREMENT & DIAGNOSTIC EQUIPMENT	5,159	7,174		7,174	8,902
87	63749A	TECHNICAL VULNERABILITY REDUCTION	4,299	3,300		3,300	3,718
88	63752A	DEMILITARIZATION CONCEPTS	9,463	0		0	0
89	63756A	DOD SOFTWARE INITIATIVES (STARS)	41,492	0		0	0
90	63758A	ARMY BATTLEFIELD TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION	11,856	12,385		12,385	12,715
91	63759A	CB DEF/SMK ADV TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	3,009	7,484		7,484	3,564

LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL AMOUNT	FY 87 REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT	FY 88 PROJECTION AMOUNT
92	63761A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE VULN/SUSCEP TECH SUPP	14,612	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
93	63762A	EW FEASIBILITY DEVELOPMENT	7,157	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
94	63763A	NONSYSTEMS MEDICAL MATERIAL DEVELOPMENT	16,026	19,492		19,492	23,077
95	63764A	MEDICAL CHEMICAL DEFENSE LIFE SUPPORT	22,353	17,390		17,390	17,040
96	63771A	ADVANCED TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOL	0	1,461	-1,461	0	1,502
97	63772A	ADV TACTICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE & TECHNOLO	0	13,674	-13,674	0	12,288
98	63773A	BATTLEFIELD SUSTAINMENT	0	3,342	-3,342	0	4,906
		CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		33,721		33,721	31,460
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED TECH DEVELOPMENT	502,856	488,034	-36,147	451,887	570,433
99	12614A	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
100	12821A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
101	33152A	WORLDWIDE MILITARY CMD&CNT SYS INF SYS	30,540	29,557		29,557	74,717
		CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	196,337	249,430		249,430	243,730
		SUBTOTAL, STRATEGIC PROGRAMS	226,877	278,987	0	278,987	318,447
102	63209A	AIR MOBILITY SUPPORT	8,281	10,848		10,848	5,528
103	63215A	JOINT SURVIVABILITY INVESTIGATIONS	890	735		735	1,045
104	63217A	GREATER SLOPE	0	0		0	0
105	63220A	ADVANCED ROTOCRAFT TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATIO	44,311	44,420		44,420	0
106	63225A	AIRDROP EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS	988	1,256		1,256	1,929
107	63302A	ANTI TACTICAL MISSILE SYSTEM	61,315	38,635		38,635	40,830
108	63303A	SURF TO SURF MSL ROCKET SYS	30,253	42,681		42,681	52,185
109	63323A	LIGHT WEIGHT AIR DEFENSE SYSTEM	0	21,717	-7,000	14,717	38,016
110	63604A	NUCLEAR MUNITIONS AND RADIACS	7,833	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
111	63608A	WEAPONS AND AMMUNITION	789	173		173	0
112	63612A	ADVANCED ANTI TANK WEAPON SYSTEM (MEDIUM	60,338	48,735		48,735	141,820
113	63615A	LETHAL CHEMICAL MUNITIONS CONCEPTS	20,141	25,307		25,307	15,660
114	63619A	LANDMINE/BARRIER SYS	22,777	10,477		10,477	8,828
115	63627A	SMOKE MUNITIONS AND MATERIEL CONCEPTS	8,497	3,189		3,189	7,709
116	63628A	ARTILLERY/MORTAR AMMO DEVELOPMENT	10,151	17,210		17,210	12,841

					COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION		
LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL AMOUNT	FY 87 REQUEST AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT	FY 88 PROJECTION AMOUNT
117	63633A	TANK/FIGHTING VEHICLE AMMO DEVELOPMENT	5,665	0		0	0
118	63635A	MOBILE PROTECTED GUN	0	0		0	16,824
119	63639A	ARMAMENT ENHANCEMENT INITIATIVE (AEI)	[ ]	[ ]	20,000	-20,000	[ ]
120	63614A	PROGRAM 292	[ ]	[ ]	10,000	-10,000	[ ]
121	63702A	ELECTRIC POWER SOURCES	11,154	8,017		8,017	15,109
122	63705A	PHYSICAL SECURITY	4,397	2,339		2,339	3,274
123	63706A	IDENTIFICATION-FRIEND OR FOE DEVELOPMENT	18,479	20,373		20,373	5,678
124	63707A	COMMUNICATIONS DEVELOPMENT	2,905	2,673		2,673	3,652
125	63711A	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT	8,128	4,588		4,588	18,170
126	63713A	ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	37,266	42,122		42,122	22,605
127	63718A	ELECT WRFR VULNERABILITY/SUCEPTIBILITY	22,633	16,912		16,912	22,124
128	63720A	CHEMICAL/BIO DETECTION WARM/SAMP MAT CON	15,008	0		0	16,019
129	63721A	CML BIO PROTECTIVE MATERIEL CONCEPTS	9,378	8,045		8,045	4,058
130	63723A	MISSION CRITICAL SOFTWARE	0	0		0	0
131	63725A	REMOTELY PILOTED VEHICLES/DRONES	259	4,917		4,917	19,973
132	63726A	COMBAT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	25,148	24,285		24,285	14,180
133	63730A	TACTICAL SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	21,441	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
134	63732A	COMBAT MEDICAL MATERIAL	9,271	8,189		8,189	11,396
135	63740A	SHORT RANGE AIR DEFENSE COMMAND AND CONT	10,000	16,189	-6,000	10,189	15,265
136	63741A	METEOROLOGIC EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	0	0		0	2,192
137	63745A	TAC ELECTRONIC SUPPORT MEASURE SYSTEMS	4,807	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
138	63746A	SINGLE CHAN GND & ABN RADIO SYS (SINCGAR	2,240	0		0	0
139	63747A	SOLDIER SUPPORT/SURVIVABILITY	4,992	4,722		4,722	6,196
140	63750A	DRUG AND VACCINE DEVELOPMENT	16,745	17,077		17,077	16,474
141	63751A	MEDICAL DEFENSE AGAINST CHEM WARFARE	30,652	26,449		26,449	29,502
142	63754A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM (ADV)	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
143	63755A	TACTICAL ELECTRONIC COUNTERMEASURES SYST	78,091	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
144	63757A	AIR DEFENSE ALTERNATIVES	30,504	103,944		103,944	188,995
145	63766A	TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	6,735	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
146	63767A	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT CONTROL SYS	969	4,608		4,608	5,318
147	63774A	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMEN	0	3,307		3,307	10,045
148	64202A	AIRCRAFT WEAPONS	12,527	0		0	0
149	64204A	AIR MOBILITY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	2,583	4,418		4,418	4,832

130

LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL	FY 87 REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION
					CHANGE FROM REQUEST	RECOMMENDATION	
			AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT
150	64206A	UH-60 BLACKHAWK	16,795	0		0	0
151	64207A	ADVANCED ATTACK HELICOPTER	9,921	12,931		12,931	6,083
152	64216A	AIRCRAFT PROPULSION SYSTEMS	69,934	111,301		111,301	149,672
153	64217A	SYNTHETIC FLIGHT TRAINING SYSTEMS	7,673	10,680		10,680	9,843
154	64218A	AIRDROP EQUIP DEVELOPMENT	3,113	3,281		3,281	3,848
155	64220A	ARMY HELICOPTER IMPROVEMENT PROG	6,720	0		0	0
156	64223A	ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY LIGHT HELICOPTER SER	0	0		0	194,445
157	64268A	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PR	15,963	0		0	0
158	64306A	STINGER	23,298	6,252		6,252	0
159	64307A	PATRIOT AIR DEFENSE MISSILE SYSTEM	50,832	0		0	0
160	64310A	HELIBORNE MISSILE-HELLFIRE	4,945	0		0	0
161	64313A	GRASS BLADE	10,747	6,698		6,698	13,278
162	64314A	MULTIPLE LAUNCH ROCKET SYSTEM	0	0		0	0
163	64321A	JOINT TACTICAL FUSION PROGRAM	155,209	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
164	64324A	JOINT TACTICAL MISSILE SYSTEM-ARMY (JTAC	128,426	88,197		88,197	97,719
165	64601A	INFANTRY SUPPORT WEAPONS	29,113	26,044		26,044	5,773
166	64603A	NUCLEAR MUNITIONS	18,074	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
167	64604A	MOBILITY	988	47,828	-15,000	32,828	38,265
168	64608A	INFANTRY WEAPONS AND AMMUNITION	0	0		0	2,237
169	64609A	SMOKE MUNITIONS & MATERIEL	5,879	7,892		7,892	15,162
170	64610A	LETHAL CHEMICAL MUNITIONS	0	0		0	20,879
171	64612A	COUNTERMINE AND BARRIERS	7,929	9,728		9,728	16,037
172	64616A	FIGHTING VEHICLE SYS	0	0		0	0
173	64619A	LANDMINE WARFARE	7,818	16,755		16,755	11,813
174	64630A	M1A1 DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM	18,717	3,798		3,798	0
175	64631A	FIELD ARTILLERY AMMUNITION	27,442	107,275	-40,000	67,275	84,479
176	64632A	105MM TANK AMMUNITION	1,574	0		0	0
177	64633A	CACTUS PLANT	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
178	64701A	COMM ENGINEERING DEV	10,602	6,473		6,473	6,296
179	64702A	JT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYS	12,105	0		0	0
180	64704A	UNATTENDED GROUND SENSORS	494	0		0	0
181	64705A	MODULAR INTEGRATED COMM AND NAVIGATION S	4,957	8,224		8,224	0
182	64706A	RADIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT	656	0		0	1,587

LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL	FY 87 REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION
					CHANGE FROM REQUEST	RECOMMENDATION	
			AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT
183	64709A	IDENTIFICATION FRIEND/FOE EQUIPMENT DEV	0	9,871		9,871	18,976
184	64710A	NIGHT VISION DEVICES	14,456	21,944		21,944	29,998
185	64711A	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT	21,662	19,934		19,934	17,743
186	64712A	ARMY COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS ENGINEE	9,247	6,113		6,113	11,058
187	64713A	COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING AND EQUIPMENT	3,986	4,363		4,363	5,423
188	64714A	TACTICAL ELECTRICAL POWER SOURCES	10,043	6,449		6,449	3,675
189	64717A	GENERAL COMBAT SUPPORT	14,225	11,538		11,538	23,905
190	64718A	PHYSICAL SECURITY	6,450	1,216		1,216	4,384
191	64722A	EDUCATION AND TRAINING	6,531	4,378		4,378	7,273
192	64723A	SPECIAL PURPOSE DETECTORS	3,217	1,181		1,181	961
193	64724A	CML/BIO DETECTION WARNING & TRAINING MAT	22,845	31,427		31,427	21,038
194	64725A	CHEM BIO PROTECTIVE MATERIEL	15,524	10,550		10,550	27,631
195	64727A	COMMAND AND CONTROL	5,757	548		548	550
196	64730A	REMOTELY PILOTED VEHICLES	73,868	91,080		91,080	19,376
197	64735A	INFRARED TERMINALLY GUIDED SUBMUNITION	0	27,114		27,114	29,546
198	64740A	TACTICAL SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	17,703	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
199	64741A	DIVISION AIR DEFENSE COMMAND AND CONTROL	32,640	82,065	30,000	52,065	116,214
200	64746A	AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	17,915	12,325		12,325	13,589
201	64750A	TAC ELECTRONIC COUNTERMEASURES SYSTEMS	34,706	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
202	64751A	SINGLE CHAN GND & ABN RADIO SYS (SINCGAR	12,735	13,922		13,922	6,709
203	64754A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM (ADV)	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
204	64757A	MEDICAL CHEMICAL DEFENSE LIFE SPT MAT	7,587	9,204		9,204	11,756
205	64758A	DRUG AND VACCINE DEVELOPMENT	10,371	10,563		10,563	10,045
206	64766A	TAC ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	11,134	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
207	64770A	JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR S	43,288	27,882		27,882	6,197
208	64779A	JT INTEROP OF TAC CMD & CONT SYS (JINTAC	6,337	7,719		7,719	8,485
209	65710A	JT CB POINT OF CONTACT, TEST AND ASSESSM	2,373	6,249		6,249	6,541
210	23724A	HV ANTI TANK ASSAULT WPN SYS (TOW)	11,693	12,468		12,468	18,938
211	23726A	ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	19,765	40,444	10,444	30,000	67,205
212	23727A	MED ANTI TANK ASSAULT WEAPON DRAGON	2,470	0		0	0
213	23730A	CHAPARRAL	17,452	5,627		5,627	0
214	23731A	SAM HAWK/HAWK IMP PROG	5,149	10,633		10,633	15,902
215	23735A	COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	72,234	79,203		79,203	67,855

6

LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL	FY 87 REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION
					CHANGE FROM REQUEST	RECOMMENDATION	
			AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT
216	23739A	AN/TSQ 73 MODIFICATIONS	0	9,671		9,671	13,887
217	23740A	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM	8,565	9,401		9,401	14,901
218	23741A	PROD IMPR VULCAN AIR DEF SYS	0	0		0	0
219	23743A	155MM	25,474	35,726		35,726	50,164
220	23744A	AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS	0	0		0	0
221	23745A	EQUIPMENT UPGRADE	25,036	23,343		23,343	6,462
222	23746A	PATRIOT PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	0	40,221		40,221	50,248
223	23747A	HELLFIRE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	0	11,947		11,947	25,301
224	23749A	MLRS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	0	0		0	650
225	23751A	SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES (SOF) EQUIPMEN	0	31,242	15,700	46,942	59,644
226	23752A	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PR	0	14,592	-3,000	11,592	15,977
227	28010A	JOINT TACTICAL COMMO PROGRAM (TRITAC)	30,233	17,401		17,401	20,182
228	33145A	EUCOM C3 SYSTEMS	1,938	1,078		1,078	1,316
		CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	140,548	616,824		616,824	654,327
		SUBTOTAL, TACTICAL PROGRAMS	2,083,622	2,440,170	-125,744	2,314,426	2,596,500
229	63712A	MAPPING AND GEODESY	3,186	0		0	0
230	64201A	AIRCRAFT AVIONICS	2,212	2,493		2,493	2,482
231	64716A	MAPPING AND GEODESY	2,227	11,473		11,473	9,122
232	64778A	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POS SYS (USER EQ)	11,146	4,719		4,719	6,700
233	31307A	FOREIGN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY CENTER	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
234	31318A	HUMINT (CONTROLLED)	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
235	31327A	TECHNICAL RECONNAISSANCE AND SURVEILLANC	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
236	31329A	EUCOM C3 DESIGN	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
237	31359A	SPECIAL ARMY PROGRAMS	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
238	33111A	STRATEGIC ARMY COMMUNICATIONS (STARCOM)	0	0		0	0
239	33126A	LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS (DCS)	4,260	2,684		2,684	2,531
240	33142A	SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT	29,466	47,239	-10,000	37,239	52,336
240	33142A	SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT	29,466	47,239		47,239	52,337
241	33401A	COMMUNICATIONS SECURITY (COMSEC)	8,993	7,280		7,280	9,187
		CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	6,814	7,293		7,293	6,995
		SUBTOTAL, INTELLIGENCE & COMMUNICATIONS	97,770	130,420	-10,000	120,420	141,690

					COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION		
LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL AMOUNT	FY 87 REQUEST AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT	FY 88 PROJECTION AMOUNT
242	63315A	TARGET MISSILES	3,952	9,731		9,731	12,924
243	63730A	NONSYSTEMS TRAINING DEVICES (NSTD) DEV	4,842	3,869		3,869	4,826
244	63790A	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	24,698	49,356		49,356	0
245	64715A	NON SYSTEM TNG DEVICES ENGR	47,122	46,260		46,260	32,062
246	64726A	METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT AND SYSTEMS	4,967	1,207		1,207	1,367
247	65201A	AVIATION ENGINEERING FLIGHT ACTIVITY	9,708	13,217		13,217	13,669
248	65321A	KWAJALEIN MISSILE RANGE	152,300	163,470	-8,470	155,000	175,793
249	65502A	SML BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH	0	0		0	0
250	65702A	SUPPORT OF DEVELOPMENT TESTING	56,404	50,444		50,444	59,963
251	65706A	MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS	16,043	16,966		16,966	17,932
252	65709A	EXPLOITATION OF FOREIGN ITEMS	3,535	3,984		3,984	4,468
253	65712A	SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING	51,937	55,745		55,745	64,739
254	65716A	THREAT SIMULATORS FOR TESTING	32,601	34,279		34,279	33,906
255	65717A	NUCLEAR SURVIVABILITY TESTING & ANALYSIS	0	3,950	-3,950	0	5,553
256	65801A	PROGRAM WIDE ACTIVITIES	171,766	85,484		85,484	93,979
257	65802A	INTL COOPERATIVE RESEARCH AND DEV	936	977		977	1,284
258	65803A	TECHNICAL INFO ACTIVITIES	6,196	6,772		6,772	7,875
259	65804A	AMC MAJOR RANGES AND TEST FACILITIES	357,120	207,799		207,799	230,412
260	65805A	MUNITIONS STANDARDZION EFFECTIVENESS & S	11,367	11,610		11,610	11,609
261	65806A	DOD HIGH ENERGY LASER SYSTEMS TEST FAC	19,940	20,729		20,729	21,471
262	65810A	RDTE SUPPORT FOR NON DEVELOPMENTAL ITEMS	0	9,194		9,194	13,170
263	65872A	PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENTS	20,747	53,893	-25,000	28,893	15,548
264	65894A	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE (RDT&E)	0	174,536	-6,600	167,936	214,054
265	65896A	BASE OPERATIONS (RDT&E)	0	202,951	-7,500	195,451	211,115
		MULTIPURPOSE 20MM AMMUNITION	0	0	2,000	2,000	---
266	65898A	MCT HQ (RESEARCH/DEVELOPMENT)	12,018	11,244		11,244	11,582
267	78011A	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	90,951	29,105		29,105	30,145
		SUBTOTAL, DEFENSEWIDE MISSION SUPPORT	1,099,150	1,266,772	-49,520	1,217,252	1,289,452
---	---	GROUND LAUNCHED HELLFIRE	0	0	15,000	15,000	---
		UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION	---	---	-366,420	-366,420	---
		TOTAL, ARMY RDT&E	4,841,472	5,550,300	-610,831	4,939,469	5,961,607

APPLIED OPTICS UNIVERSITY RESEARCH

The committee believes that the number of university centers (currently just *two*) conducting research in applied optics for the Department of Defense should be increased. Any newly-designated center should have broad spectrum optics capabilities and be located so as to meet Department of Defense needs. To overcome the shortage of trained personnel in infrared detector fabrication, any newly-designated center should also have the capability to train researchers as well as to develop new optics materials.

The committee recommends that the directors of Department of Defense supported university optics centers be constituted as an informal committee to assess the current and future optics needs of the individual services and of the Department of Defense as a whole, and that they be tasked to provide assistance and guidance to the Department in that regard.

LHX—AIRCRAFT PROPULSION SYSTEMS/ADVANCED ROTOCRAFT TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION

The administration requested $111.3 million for the development of the T-800 Advanced Technology (1,200 shaft horse power class) engine intended for use in the Army's new light helicopter family (LHX). In a complementary program, Advanced Rotocraft Technology Integration (ARTI), the administration requested $44.0 million for the development of advanced rotocraft concepts also intended for incorporation in the LHX.

The committee recognizes the need to develop an affordable and reliable replacement for the Army's existing inventory of light helicopters. In 1985 the average age of the Army's light helicopter fleet was just under 16 years. By 1990, that average age will increase to 20.7 years. The extended operation of such an aging fleet will inevitably result in increased operating and support (O&S) costs as well as greater safety hazards.

While endorsing the requirement to acquire a new light helicopter, the committee remains concerned over the overall cost of the program (nearly $40 billion in fiscal year 1984 dollars) and believes the Army should continue its cautious approach toward the selection of technologies for the program. In the face of current budgetary constraints it is not clear that the program as currently envisioned will be affordable. Additional information, such as that expected from the ARTI program and from the Army's Cost and Operational Effectiveness Analysis (COEA), will be required before the committee is prepared to commit to the development of the LHX.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request.

M-1 DIESEL ALTERNATIVE

The M-1 Abrams Main Battle Tank is currently powered by a 1,500 horsepower turbine engine (AGT-1500) which is being procured on a sole source, multiyear basis.

While the performance of the AGT-1500 engine has been excellent, the committee nevertheless believes that substantial benefits could be derived from introducing competition into the engine procurement program. Such competition could come either in the form of a competitive procurement (or second source) for the AGT-1500 or from evaluation of a diesel alternative to the AGT-1500. The committee believes both approaches should be considered.

The committee believes particular attention should be paid to the evaluation of suitable diesel alternative power plants for future production M-1's and possible follow-on applications. This effort should focus on existing engines (particularly where increased commonality with NATO systems might be achieved) and should be conducted at minimal cost to the government.

The committee encourages the conduct of "side by side" testing of diesel alternatives and the AGT-1500 to evaluate such characteristics as acceleration, maximum speed, fuel economy, etc. To perform these tests the Army is expected to make available at least two vehicles to any engine manufacturer offering a suitable engine for competition.

The Army is authorized to reprogram funds below the statutory reprogramming threshold to conduct this competitive evaluation.

REMOTELY PILOTED VEHICLES (AQUILA)

The administration requested $91.9 million for research and development and $117.7 million for the procurement of the Aquila Remotely Piloted Vehicle. The Aquila is a small, unmanned air vehicle designed to perform target acquisition, designation, aerial reconnaissance, artillery adjustment, and battlefield post-strike assessment missions.

Unsatisfactory Aquila system performance through September of 1985 led the Army to suspend further tests and establish mandatory system performance criteria for the system. Since that time, the program has proceeded at the contractor's expense and many of the previously noted deficiencies appear to have been corrected.

The committee supports the requirement for a system with the capabilities envisioned in the Aquila but remains concerned over the rising costs of the Aquila program and the poor system performance in fiscal year 1985.

The committee notes that in the face of dramatic program cost growth and following congressional direction, the Army has restructured the Aquila program. The number of battery sets has been reduced from 13 to 9, the number of air vehicles dropped from 543 to 376 and the number of FLIR packages reduced from 350 to 244. Despite these dramatic reductions in quantities, the procurement estimate has declined only $100 million from $1.2 billion to about $1.1 billion. The committee considers such a price for the reduced Aquila quantities to be unacceptable.

The responsibility for the unsatisfactory history of the Aquila program is shared equally by the Army and the prime contractor. In eight years the Army has had six program managers purportedly managing the program, and just recently, the Army transferred the management oversight from the Army's Aviation Systems Command to the Army's Missile Command. The prime contractor's management efforts have been equally disjointed and undistinguished.

The committee believes that in order to preserve the potential benefits of the Aquila, and to ensure some return on more than $600 million already invested, certain actions should be taken immediately. First, all Aquila specifications should be thoroughly reviewed and, where appropriate, revised to achieve cost reductions without sacrificing reliability or essential performance. Next, all subsystems (FLIR, TV, data link, etc.) should be individually reevaluated and alternatives sought in an effort to reduce overall system costs. Third, and most importantly, the Army should negotiate a binding cap on the program ("not to exceed") substantially below the current production estimate of $1.1 billion.

In addition to these management actions, before approving the release of production funds, the committee will require that the Aquila meet all system operational test criteria established by the Army and complete a successful assessment by the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation, Office of the Secretary of Defense.

The committee recommends authorization of $91.9 million for research and development of the Aquila. The committee also recommends $50.0 million for initial procurement of Aquila subject to the restrictions in the preceding paragraph.

ADVANCED FIELD ARTILLERY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM/MARINE INTEGRATED FIRE AND AIR SUPPORT SYSTEM

Both the Army and Marine Corps are developing modern artillery fire support systems. The Army is developing the Advanced Field Artillery Tactical Data System (AFATDS) while the Marines are developing the Marine Integrated Fire and Air Support System (MIFASS). While there are differences in the requirements for the two systems (most of which are doctrinal—the Marines, for example, require MIFASS to coordinate air support, the Army's AFATDS does not), it is not clear that these differences are sufficient to justify two entirely separate systems.

The committee notes that both the Army and Marines use essentially the same artillery pieces and ammunition, and that all Army and Marine artillery personnel receive identical training at Fort Sill, Oklahoma. Given this commonality in training and equipment, it is particularly difficult to comprehend a need for two distinct (and possibly incompatible) systems.

The committee further notes that one likely explanation of the Defense Department's willingness to permit two essentially similar systems to proceed toward fielding is that one (AFATDS) falls under the purview of the Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering while the other (MIFASS) is the responsibility of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Command, Control, Communications and Intelligence. A recommendation by the General Accounting Office (GAO) that the programs be consolidated under one office has not been acted upon.

The committee believes that a common solution to both the Army's and Marine Corps' requirements is desirable and should be possible. Such a solution should result in a lower overall unit acquisition cost, common logistics and reduced system life-cycle costs, more economical training and training support, and greater interoperability between the two services.

Therefore, the committee directs that one program be selected to meet the needs of both services. Should the Secretary of Defense determine, after a thorough evaluation of both programs and the requirements of both services, that continuation of both systems is justified, he may do so only upon certification to the Congress that such a course is both operationally sound and cost-effective. In order to minimize the disruption in whichever program is ultimately selected, the committee requests the Secretary of Defense report his decision to the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services no later than December 15, 1986.

The committee recommends an authorization of $7.737 million for the development of MIFASS and $30.0 million for the development of AFATDS.

AIRLIFT FOR SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES

In the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (Public Law 99-145) the Congress required the Secretary of Defense to submit a plan to the Congress which fulfills the airlift requirements of the special operations forces assigned to the Unified Commanders in Chief, as well as to the Joint Special Operations Command. Further, the Congress required the Secretary of Defense to certify that the five year defense plan contained sufficient funds to carry out those plans.

The Secretary of Defense submitted the airlift master plan for special operations forces on April 1, 1986. The committee endorses the plan, and commends the Department of Defense for substantially increasing its commitment to special operations forces.

Because the master plan and certification was submitted after the fiscal year 1987 budget was reported to the Congress, most of the expanded airlift program will depend on funding in 1988 and subsequent years. The committee recommends accelerating one component of the plan, the modification of existing H-60 and CH-47 helicopters with special equipment essential to the special operations mission. The increase of $15.7 million in fiscal year 1987 does not represent an increase in total development costs, but rather a shifting forward of funding requirements which the Army had budgeted for fiscal year 1988. Increasing the funding level in 1987 will ensure timely fielding of the MH-60 and MH-47 helicopters.

The committee will monitor closely the Defense Department's compliance with the Secretary of Defense's master plan. The military departments are expected to comply fully with the Secretary's directives and certification.

REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE AND BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT

The administration requested a total of $377.5 million for Army RDT&E for real property maintenance and base operations support for Army RDT&E facilities for fiscal year 1987. This account is a new account for fiscal year 1987. A $12.1 million net reduction is recommended by the committee to these accounts. The committee recommends no undistributed reduction be made to these two programs.

MULTIPURPOSE 20MM AMMUNITION

The committee recommends a $2.0 million increase to the RDT&E Army account to continue expeditious research and development leading to type classification of a 20MM multipurpose projectile which will be used to enhance the capability of the Product Improved Vulcan Air Defense System (PIVADS) and existing 20MM systems.

GROUND LAUNCHED HELLFIRE MISSILE

The Hellfire is a helicopter-fired, laser guided missile intended for deployment as the primary anti-armor weapon system on the Army's AH-64 Apache helicopter.

There is a need for a longer range, more lethal anti-armor weapon system than that currently available to Army divisions. The committee has been advised that the 9th Infantry Division (Motorized) has been evaluating ground launched Hellfire since 1982. This evaluation has included live firings from two prototype HMMWV surrogate platforms.

The committee believes the ground launched Hellfire may satisfy the urgent, near-term, anti-armor requirements of the Army's Motorized Division while increasing our overall anti-armor capability. The committee therefore recommends $15 million be authorized for the evaluation and qualification of the ground launched derivative of the Hellfire missile.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY

(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL	FY 87 REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION
					CHANGE FROM REQUEST	RECOMMENDATION	
			AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT
1	61103N	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH	6,245	12,068		12,068	24,142
2	61152N	INHOUSE IND LAB RSRCH	26,221	26,918		26,918	27,983
3	61153N	DEF RESRCH SCIENCES	332,932	349,853		349,853	363,909
4	62111N	AAW/ASUW TECHNOLOGY	77,416	75,244		75,244	82,114
5	62113N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	15,360	13,946		13,946	15,368
6	62121N	SURFACE SHIP TECHNOLOGY	13,047	13,515		13,515	17,133
7	62122N	AIRCRAFT TECHNOLOGY	23,621	21,111		21,111	24,219
8	62131M	MARINE CORPS AIR-GROUND TECHNOLOGY	14,461	17,628		17,628	19,385
9	62232N	COMMAND, CONTROL & COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOL	18,843	20,242		20,242	26,222
10	62233N	MISSION SUPPORT TECHNOLOGY	37,671	34,238		34,238	33,157
11	62234N	SYSTEMS SUPPORT TECHNOLOGY	67,668	65,799		65,799	75,710
12	62314N	ASW TECHNOLOGY	84,763	90,060		90,060	87,647
13	62315N	MINE & SPECIAL WARFARE	12,179	14,038		14,038	16,253
14	62323N	SUBMARINE TECHNOLOGY	14,549	12,441		12,441	13,440
15	62324N	NUCLEAR PROPULSION	52,026	43,876		43,876	48,046
16	62435N	OCEAN & ATMOSPHERIC SUPPORT TECHNOLOGY	24,412	25,354		25,354	27,425
17	62936N	INDEPENDENT EXPLORATORY DEVELOPMENT	14,173	14,717		14,717	15,861
		SUBTOTAL, TECHNOLOGY BASE	835,587	851,048	0	851,048	918,014
18	63202N	AVIONICS	1,735	3,858		3,858	3,861
19	63210N	ADV AIRCRAFT PROPULSION SYS	2,995	6,638		6,638	8,555
20	63217N	ADV A/C SUB SYSTEMS	8,464	7,944		7,944	22,249
21	63269N	NATIONAL AEROSPACE PLANE	0	25,527		25,527	52,098
22	63303N	ERASE SYS TECH	9,901	6,486		6,486	9,931
23	63308N	A/S-A/A MSL TECH	0	0		0	0
24	63508N	SHIP PROPULSION SYSTEM	30,302	22,474	-7,474	15,000	38,713
25	63526N	ADV COMP TECH	10,536	0		0	0

LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL	FY 87 REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION
			AMOUNT	AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT	AMOUNT
26	63560N	SUBMARINE HULL ARRAY DEV (ADV)	7,623	8,891		8,891	3,932
27	63573N	ELECTRIC DRIVE	9,641	9,816		9,816	21,328
28	63701N	HUMAN FACTORS ENG (HFE)	2,088	3,964		3,964	6,276
29	63706N	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	12,442	16,700		16,700	16,872
30	63707N	MNPWR & PERSONNEL SYS	3,569	6,658		6,658	8,652
31	63712N	GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECH DEMO	5,000	21,236		21,236	32,136
32	63720N	EDUCATION AND TRAINING	2,955	6,536		6,536	10,783
33	63732M	ADV MANPWR TRNG SYS	2,933	1,837		1,837	2,886
34	63733N	SIMU & TRAINING DEVICES	7,826	8,218		8,218	9,605
35	63739N	NAVY LOGISTICS PRODUCTIVITY	754	934		934	3,385
36	63747N	ADV ASW TECH	0	25,063		25,063	20,761
37	63792N	ADV TECH TRANSITION	0	13,492		13,492	22,346
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED TECH DEVELOPMENT	118,764	196,272	7,474	188,798	294,369
38	63451N	TACT SPACE OPERATIONS	14,002	22,506		22,506	16,039
39	63588N	SSBN SURVIVABILITY	0	2,703	-2,703	0	7,308
40	63735N	WWMCCS ARCHITECTURE SUPPT	0	0		0	0
41	63741N	SATELLITE LASER COMM	0	5,875		5,875	4,900
42	64363N	TRIDENT II	2,104,376	1,632,866		1,632,866	1,179,773
43	65856N	STRAT TECH SUPPORT	3,212	3,914		3,914	4,095
44	11221N	FLT BALLSTC MIS SYS	20,778	40,222		40,222	59,274
45	11224N	SSBN SEC TECH PROG	38,588	54,739		54,739	70,893
46	11228N	TRIDENT	38,195	51,783		51,783	86,182
47	11401N	EXTRME LOW FREQ COMM	28,256	18,296		18,296	3,179
48	11402N	NAVY STRATEGIC COMM	121,162	143,282		143,282	97,426
49	12427N	NAV SPASUR	952	1,563		1,563	1,774
50	33131N	MEECN	1,615	1,687		1,687	1,301
51	33152N	WIS MODERNIZATION	14,932	21,610		21,610	44,715
		SUBTOTAL, STRATEGIC PROGRAMS	2,386,068	2,001,046	-2,703	1,998,343	1,576,859
52	63109N	INTEGRATED A/C AVIONICS	0	22,484		22,484	27,818

LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL	FY 87 REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION
					CHANGE FROM REQUEST	RECOMMENDATION	
			AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT
53	63206N	ELECT W/F ADV. DEV.	54,039	39,294		39,294	54,460
54	63207N	AIR/OCEAN TACT. APPLIC.	6,730	7,522		7,522	10,676
55	63208N	T-45/TS	115,986	134,163		134,163	94,579
56	63216N	AIRBRNE LIFE SUPT SYS	1,371	4,377		4,377	4,685
57	63219N	ADV AIRCFT ARMAMENT SYS	3,999	0		0	0
58	63228N	CV ASW MODULE	3,977	4,255		4,255	5,281
59	63251N	AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS	9,891	5,547		5,547	4,522
60	63254N	AIR ASW	4,625	9,131		9,131	8,270
61	63256N	JVX	557,326	0		0	0
62	63257N	A 6F	236,051	143,256		143,256	74,236
63	63259N	ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS	0	0		0	0
64	63260N	ABN MINE CNTRMEASURES	12,575	11,565		11,565	15,109
65	63261N	TAC AIR RECONN	2,207	18,042		18,042	27,705
66	63262N	ACFT SURVIV/VULNERABLTY	13,622	19,054		19,054	22,287
67	63268N	NAVAL AIRSHIP	0	9,834		9,834	9,849
68	63306N	ADV. AIR TO SURF MSL.	21,692	42,409		42,409	22,569
69	63313N	IRR MAVERICK	0	245		245	492
70	63315N	RETRACT YELLOW	0	0		0	0
71	63318N	ADV AIR-AIR SURF-AIR MSL	25,000	79,728		79,728	126,804
72	63320N	LOW COST ANTI RADIATION SEEKER	17,452	14,704		14,704	26,766
73	63367N	SUB ASW STANDOFF WPN	74,828	0		0	0
74	63382N	BGAAWC	7,720	13,746		13,746	17,911
75	63502N	SURFACE MCM	22,415	22,678	-8,000	14,678	28,506
76	63504N	SUB SONAR DEV	11,010	11,109		11,109	10,702
77	63506N	SURF SHIP TORPEDO DEFNS	36,207	36,908		36,908	33,303
78	63509N	SHPBD INFO TRANSFER SYS	0	0		0	0
79	63512N	CATAPULTS	0	0		0	7,568
80	63513N	SHIPBRD SYS COMPNT DEV	15,145	14,917		14,917	18,959
81	63514N	SHIPBRD DAMAGE CONTROL	23,400	41,861		41,861	46,306
82	63519N	ADV COMMAND DATA SYS	0	0		0	0
83	63522N	SUB ARCTIC WF/SPT EQUIP PROG	9,445	2,946		2,946	3,142
84	63525N	PILOT FISH	93,964	75,248		75,248	62,012
85	63527N	RETRACT LARCH	0	0		0	20,053

LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL AMOUNT	FY 87 REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT	FY 88 PROJECTION AMOUNT
86	63528N	NONACOUSTIC ASW	21,604	26,139		26,139	24,216
87	63529N	ADV ASW TARGET	9,142	10,282		10,282	17,204
88	63532N	SHIP SYS ENGR STDS	2,700	0		0	0
89	63536N	RETRACT JUNIPER	21,159	28,935		28,935	36,837
90	63542N	RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL	2,140	2,592		2,592	3,005
91	63550N	LINK DOGWOOD	25,247	3,931		3,931	0
92	63553N	SURFACE ASW	16,728	23,168		23,168	31,239
93	63561N	ADV SUB SYS DEVELOPMENT	169,318	0		0	0
94	63562N	SUB TAC WARFARE SYS	23,118	10,689		10,689	9,344
95	63564N	SHIP DEVELOPMENT	13,562	21,606		21,606	34,425
96	63565N	SURFACE SHIP NAVSYS	999	6,675		6,675	8,246
97	63569N	ATTACK SUBMARINE DEV	31,502	3,931		3,931	3,936
98	63570N	ADV NUC REACTOR COMP SYS DEV	120,175	96,037		96,037	89,157
99	63571N	PHYSICAL SECURITY	3,690	7,686		7,686	8,533
100	63576N	CHALK EAGLE	68,783	79,351		79,351	87,338
101	63578N	A4W/A1G NUC PROP PLANT	3,327	3,410		3,410	3,936
102	63582N	COMBAT SYS INTEGRATION	21,962	24,051		24,051	25,860
103	63589N	DDG 51	0	0		0	0
104	63591N	JOINT ADVANCED SYSTEMS	0	78,680		78,680	9,053
105	63592N	SEA STAR	0	0		0	2,457
106	63601N	MINE DEVELOPMENT	4,436	14,836		14,836	26,450
107	63602N	CHALK PINE	0	43,711		43,711	115,306
108	63609N	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	21,924	40,882		40,882	39,285
109	63610N	ALWT (ADV)	0	7,434	-7,434	0	11,749
110	63611M	MC ASSAULT VEHICLES	10,407	11,005		11,005	13,321
111	63634N	TAC NUCLEAR WEAPON DEV	7,760	15,151	-7,151	8,000	22,214
112	63635M	MC GRD COMBAT/SPT SYS	13,126	18,249		18,249	12,252
113	63654N	JT SERV EXPL ORDN DEV	12,577	14,791		14,791	13,402
114	63702N	OCEAN ENG SYS DEV	1,349	1,417		1,417	1,393
115	63704N	ASW OCEANOGRAPHY	11,875	7,065		7,065	8,572
		NAVAL OCEANOGRAPHY	0	0	3,000	3,000	---
116	63705N	LOGISTICS	0	0		0	0
117	63708N	ASW SIGNAL PROCESSING	13,951	17,988		17,988	21,729

143

LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL	FY 87 REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION
					CHANGE FROM REQUEST	RECOMMENDATION	
			AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT
118	63709N	ADV MARINE BIO SYSTEM	5,409	5,385		5,385	6,870
119	63711N	FLEET TAC D&E PROGRAM	1,999	4,649		4,649	6,836
120	63713N	OCEAN ENG TECH DEV	13,086	16,373		16,373	17,600
121	63717N	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYS	30,093	36,525		36,525	21,476
122	63719N	CONTAINER OFFLD/TRNSFR SYS	1,512	5,602		5,602	1,673
123	63722N	NAVAL SPECIAL WARFARE	6,716	15,637		15,637	15,259
124	63724N	NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	18,310	16,833		16,833	18,828
125	63725N	FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT	7,258	9,476		9,476	10,600
126	63726N	MERSHIP NAV AUX PROG	5,737	6,014	-6,014	0	5,039
127	63729M	COMBAT SERVICES SUP (ADV)	9,341	15,857		15,857	21,986
128	63730M	MC INTEL/ELC WAR SYS	70	0		0	0
129	63734N	CHALK CORAL	6,139	14,694		14,694	3,641
130	63736N	STRIKE WARFARE TECH	0	0		0	0
131	63737N	LINK HAZEL	23,064	37,566		37,566	34,207
132	63740N	LINK LAUREL	35,345	47,088		47,088	75,483
133	63743N	ARIADNE	2,185	11,240		11,240	15,278
134	63744N	LINK SPRUCE	35,000	94,272		94,272	170,165
135	63746N	RETRACT MAPLE	9,747	20,782		20,782	33,830
136	63763N	NCCS SE&I	7,172	12,599		12,599	17,903
137	63784N	ASW SURVEILLANCE	17,393	25,982		25,982	52,661
138	63785N	ASW ENVIRONMENTAL ACOUSTIC SPT	15,680	12,764		12,764	15,478
139	63787N	SPECIAL PROCESSES	49,532	41,466		41,466	37,272
140	63788N	ROSS	0	0		0	0
141	64203N	STANDARD AVIONICS DEVELOPMENT	14,668	19,432		19,432	32,814
142	64211N	IFF SYS DEV	17,141	23,449		23,449	55,412
143	64212N	LAMPS	14,045	19,712	-15,718	3,994	10,604
144	64213N	HELO DEV	5,766	11,084		11,084	12,748
145	64214N	AV 8B AIRCRAFT (ENG)	65,300	48,639		48,639	20,458
146	64215N	SUPPORT EQUIP	20,105	32,492		32,492	79,669
147	64217N	S 3 WEAPONS SYS IMPRVMNT	15,583	15,644		15,644	0
148	64218N	AIR OCEAN EQUIP ENG	-2,460	3,294		3,294	2,990
149	64219N	AIRBORNE ASW DEV	5,601	2,266		2,266	5,512
150	64220N	ACFT IR SIGNATURE SUPPR	1,500	0		0	0

LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL	FY 87 REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION
					CHANGE FROM REQUEST	RECOMMENDATION	
			AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT
151	64221N	P-3 MODERNIZATION PROG	33,110	96,877	-19,677	77,200	82,404
152	64224N	ABN EW ENG.	56,096	55,973		55,973	41,801
153	64226N	ASPJ	20,796	19,947		19,947	12,131
154	64229N	CV IZ ASW HELO	12,389	8,062		8,062	0
155	64252N	A/C PROPULSION (ENG)	44,566	27,500		27,500	300
156	64255N	EW SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	35,260	51,896		51,896	58,125
157	64260N	C/MH-53E	1,177	3,464		3,464	8,749
158	64261N	ACOUSTIC SRCH SENSORS (ENG)	30,146	56,761		56,761	58,832
159	64262N	V-22	0	386,871		386,871	483,087
160	64264N	AVIATION LIFE SPT SYS	27,418	29,705		29,705	31,635
161	64268N	ACFT ENGINE COMPNT IMP	61,534	65,183		65,183	70,876
162	64301N	MK-92 FCS UPGRADE	13,154	7,808	-7,808	0	12,716
163	64303N	AEGIS AREA AIR DEF	10,654	4,312		4,312	6,822
164	64307N	AEGIS WPN SYS IMP	121,742	134,939		134,939	117,044
165	64308N	LINK ASH	10,307	8,846		8,846	10,825
166	64309N	SEA LANCE	0	118,416		118,416	130,947
167	64314N	AMRAAM	4,797	19,022		19,022	27,987
168	64352N	SUR LNCHD WEAPNRY SHIP SYS	0	0		0	0
169	64353N	VERTICAL LAUNCHING SYS	29,141	20,388		20,388	22,278
170	64354N	AIR/AIR MSL SYS ENGR	18,545	27,906		27,906	24,116
171	64355N	VLS ASROC	41,063	41,669		41,669	18,685
172	64358N	CLOSE-IN WPN (PHALANX)	4,758	7,493		7,493	11,683
173	64361N	NATO SEA SPARROW	2,469	7,745		7,745	7,874
174	64365N	SM 2 (N)	2,795	9,229	-9,229	0	15,040
175	64366N	STNDRD MISSILE IMPRVMNTS	45,453	45,988		45,988	75,584
176	64367N	TOMAHAWK	61,987	68,368		68,368	70,953
177	64369N	5 IN. ROLLING AIR FRM MSLE	10,936	24,210	-24,210	0	15,121
	-	POINT DEFENSE UPGRADE	0	0	2,000	2,000	---
178	64370N	SSN 688 CLASS VLS	18,495	18,344		18,344	14,608
179	64371N	HELLFIRE	0	0		0	0
180	64372N	NEW THREAT UPGRADE	53,882	50,899		50,899	36,337
181	64502N	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS	4,426	25,979		25,979	19,745
182	64503N	SUBMARINE SONAR DEV	38,904	52,716		52,716	44,742

LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL AMOUNT	FY 87 REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT	FY 88 PROJECTION AMOUNT
183	64504N	AIR CONTROL ENG	19,788	9,207		9,207	29,079
184	64506N	CW COUNTERMEASURES	6,079	7,799		7,799	8,257
185	64507N	EMSP	93,397	100,345		100,345	66,730
186	64508N	RADAR SURVEILLANCE EQUIP	6,318	9,321		9,321	15,016
187	64510N	COMMUNICATION SYSTEMS	0	0		0	0
188	64511N	INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS	900	0		0	0
189	64515N	SUB SPT EQUIP PROG	13,633	32,265		32,265	35,784
190	64516N	SHIP SURVIVABILITY	5,883	9,194		9,194	11,287
191	64518N	CMBT INFO CNTR CONVERSN	29,198	36,727		36,727	31,596
192	64520N	SUBMARINE HULL ARRAY DEV	9,488	0		0	0
193	64524N	SUB COMBAT SYSTEMS	193,508	316,649		316,649	277,253
194	64561N	SSN-21 DEVELOPMENT	0	256,668		256,668	224,921
195	64562N	SUB TACT WARFARE SYS	36,559	47,101		47,101	41,170
196	64563N	PHYSICAL SECURITY (ENG)	3,601	9,015		9,015	9,543
197	64567N	SHIP SUBSYS DEV/LBTS	107,356	18,822		18,822	28,106
198	64569N	NATO SEA GNAT	2,284	0		0	0
199	64573N	SHIPBD ELEC WARFR IMPRV	61,925	51,932		51,932	54,573
200	64574N	STD EMBEDDED COMPUTER RSRCS	9,160	32,469		32,469	55,878
201	64575N	SQS-53C	36,269	26,514		26,514	13,239
202	64570N	LINK BIRCH	4,078	3,927		3,927	5,408
203	64601N	MINE DEVELOPMENT	9,048	13,740		13,740	15,174
204	64602N	NAVAL GUNNERY IMPROVEMENT	9,650	17,428		17,428	21,529
205	64603N	UNGUID CONVL AIRLNCH WEP	4,619	5,626		5,626	5,818
206	64604N	CHEM WARFARE WEAPONS	6,000	4,000		4,000	0
207	64608N	SAL GP/EO SENS DEV	38,933	21,156	-4,924	16,232	16,150
208	64609N	BOMB FUZE IMPR	5,617	14,711		14,711	14,992
209	64610N	MK 50 TORP (ALWT)	157,626	148,825		148,825	79,795
210	64654N	JT SERV EOD DEV (ENG)	4,405	5,420		5,420	5,667
211	64656M	MC ASSAULT VEHCLE	16,801	0		0	0
212	64657M	MC GRND CMBT/SPT ARMS	7,183	12,541		12,541	16,343
213	64675N	MK 48 ADCAP (ENG)	62,605	37,895		37,895	42,694
214	64704N	ASW OCEANOGRAPHIC EQUIP	506	1,162		1,162	1,389
215	64705N	CHALK BANYAN	5,826	16,600		16,600	8,454

LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL	FY 87 REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION
					CHANGE FROM REQUEST	RECOMMENDATION	
			AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT
216	64707N	THEATER MISSION PLAN CTR	0	22,275		22,275	31,547
217	64708N	INITIAL TRAINERS ACQUISITION	0	84,621		84,621	88,535
218	64710N	NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	9,788	9,044		9,044	11,721
219	64711N	NCCS ASHORE NODES	48,783	53,029		53,029	41,916
220	64713N	SURF ASW SYS IMP	7,956	36,860		36,860	65,143
221	64714N	AIR W/F TRNG DEV	0	1,964		1,964	1,966
222	64715N	SURFACE W/F TRNG DEV	23,273	28,631		28,631	31,447
223	64716N	SUB W/F TRNG DEV	0	0		0	0
224	64717M	COMBAT SERVICES SPT	3,638	5,465		5,465	5,821
225	64718M	MC INTEL/ELEC WAR SYS	14,140	9,546		9,546	11,332
226	64719M	MC CMD/CNTRL/COMM SYS	13,361	16,005		16,005	16,120
227	64720M	TACAIR OPER CENT 85	0	0		0	0
228	64725N	REGIONAL TAC SURV	56,216	40,971		40,971	12,904
229	64761N	INTELLIGENCE (ENG)	8,040	6,460		6,460	7,699
230	64771N	MEDICAL DEV (ENG)	1,382	2,997		2,997	4,523
231	64779N	JT INTEROP TAC CMD/CNTRL	6,056	3,586		3,586	3,422
232	64780M	JT INTEROP TAC CMD/CNTRL MC	1,668	3,471		3,471	3,765
233	65155N	FLEET TAC DEV/EVAL	16,085	16,590		16,590	20,141
234	65803N	ELECTROMAGN SPECTRUM MGT	2,572	5,873		5,873	7,308
235	65853N	MNGMNT AND TECH SPT	7,858	14,296		14,296	16,682
236	65867N	C2 SURV RECON SUP	3,979	5,342		5,342	5,947
237	65871M	MC TAC EXPLOIT NAT CAP	415	849		849	1,175
238	24134N	A-6 SQUADRONS	22,382	13,820		13,820	14,482
239	24136N	F/A-18 SQUADRONS	58,274	59,093		59,093	63,474
240	24152N	ERLY WRNG ACFT SQDRNS	23,569	34,454		34,454	63,445
241	24161N	AVIATION SPT CVW	1,757	2,221		2,221	7,466
242	24163N	FLEET TCC (TAC)	38,561	63,733		63,733	95,211
243	24281N	SUBMARINES	0	0		0	0
244	24311N	UNDERSEA SURVEIL SYS	48,232	34,198		34,198	38,611
245	24313N	SURTASS	1,993	5,833		5,833	6,356
246	24571N	SPECIAL PROJECTS	16,982	10,500		10,500	14,408
247	24573N	COVER AND DECEPTION PROG	23,787	15,066		15,066	19,500
248	24575N	EW READINESS SUPPORT	7,067	4,421		4,421	8,736

					COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION		
			FY 86 FINAL	FY 87 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	RECOMMENDATION	FY 88 PROJECTION
LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT	PROGRAM	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT
249	24576N	COUNTER C3 DEV	22,320	23,952		23,952	25,109
250	25601N	HARM IMPROVEMENTS	2,633	3,931		3,931	3,109
251	25604N	TACTICAL INFO SYS	0	48,071		48,071	55,642
252	25620N	ASW CMBT SYS INTEGRATION	10,391	17,409		17,409	19,532
253	25633N	ACFT EQ RELIABLTY/MAINT PROG	7,557	8,846		8,846	9,841
254	25634N	SUB SILENCING	31,533	0		0	0
255	25658N	LAB FLEET SUPPORT	6,146	6,056		6,056	7,346
256	25667N	F-14 UPGRADE	347,865	268,421		268,421	156,657
257	25670N	TAC INTELL PROCESSING	1,454	2,160		2,160	2,128
258	25674N	EW COUNTER RESPONSE	78,186	69,708		69,708	58,509
259	25675N	OPERATIONAL REACTOR DEV	12,719	18,872		18,872	22,745
260	26313M	MAR CORPS TELECOM	3,587	11,644		11,644	14,559
261	26623M	MC GRD COMBAT/SUP ARMS SYS	41,800	67,934		67,934	54,640
262	26624M	MC COMBAT SERVICES SPT	1,449	2,548		2,548	3,857
263	26625M	MC INTEL/ELEC WAR SYS	1,163	24,822		24,822	24,149
264	26626M	MC CMD/CNTL/COMM SYS	39,064	39,925		39,925	57,999
265	26627M	MC TECH SUPP C/C SYS	4,094	7,471		7,471	8,016
266	28010M	TRI TAC MC	9,000	6,959		6,959	12,339
267	28010N	TRI TAC NAVY	0	0		0	0
		SUBTOTAL, TACTICAL PROGRAMS	5,375,213	6,035,049	-105,165	5,929,884	6,191,443
268	63518N	ADV NAVIGATION DEVEL	1,541	0		0	0
269	64514N	NAVIGATION SYSTEMS	918	641		641	1,993
270	64577N	EHF SATCOM	39,197	53,141	-10,000	43,141	39,994
271	64777N	NAVSTAR GPS	61,525	76,513		76,513	89,031
272	65866N	C2 SYS PLANNING/ENGR SPT	5,314	0		0	0
273	31303N	FIELD OP INTEL OFFICE	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
274	31326N	PRAIRIE SCHOONER	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
275	31327N	TECH RECONNAISSIANCE AND SURVEILLANCE	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
276	33109N	SATELLITE COMM	17,623	11,753	-3,000	8,753	14,578
277	33401N	COMMUNICATIONS SECURITY	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
278	33603N	MILSTAR JOINT PROJ OFC TERMINAL	4,095	4,198		4,198	4,449

			COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION			
LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL AMOUNT	FY 87 REQUEST AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT	FY 88 PROJECTION AMOUNT
279	34111N	SPECIAL ACTIVITIES CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	[ ] 450,343	[ ] 548,784	-40,000	[ ] 508,784	[ ] 615,454
		SUBTOTAL, INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS	580,556	695,030	-53,000	642,030	765,499
280	63721N	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECT	8,225	8,720		8,720	9,382
281	63790N	NATO COOPERATIVE	25,000	49,091		49,091	0
282	64208N	RANGE INSTRMNTATN SYS DEV	11,967	11,347		11,347	13,577
283	64258N	TARGET SYS DEV	96,934	111,690		111,690	121,867
284	64703N	PERS TRNG, SIMULATION & HUMAN FACTORS	5,800	6,823		6,823	6,799
285	65151M	STUDIES ANALYSIS SPT--MC	1,785	1,811		1,811	2,439
286	65152N	STUDIES ANALYS SPT--NAVY	6,433	8,031		8,031	11,257
287	65153M	MC OPS ANALYS GP CNA	3,714	4,068		4,068	4,739
288	65154N	CNTR FOR NAV ANALYSIS	17,500	18,603		18,603	22,837
289	65156M	MC OPERATNL TEST/EVAL	2,317	1,751		1,751	1,988
290	65502N	SBIR	0	0		0	0
291	65804N	TECH INFO SERVICES	2,244	2,543		2,543	3,183
292	65852N	AUTEC	43,197	0		0	0
293	65854M	DEVEL CENTER SUPPORT	3,958	5,300		5,300	5,693
294	65857N	INTERNATIONAL RDT/E	2,820	3,687		3,687	4,203
295	65859N	MOBILE SEA RANGE	4,709	0		0	0
296	65861N	RDTE LAB/FAC MGT SPT	61,575	54,974		54,974	57,121
297	65862N	RDTE INSTRUMNTN/MAT SPT	18,895	19,789		19,789	35,404
298	65863N	RDTE SHIP/AIRCFT SPT	73,596	81,335		81,335	98,147
299	65864N	TEST/EVAL SPT	285,639	330,580		330,580	359,058
300	65865N	OPER TEST/EVAL CAPABLTY	6,281	6,853		6,853	9,209
301	35111N	WEATHER SERVICE	1,146	1,000		1,000	990
302	35160N	DEF METEOR SATEL PROG	45,839	49,040		49,040	53,307
303	78011N	MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY	51,177	31,319		31,319	36,215
		SUBTOTAL, DEFENSEWIDE MISSION SUPPORT	780,751	808,355	0	808,355	857,415

			FY 86 FINAL	FY 87 REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION
LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT	PROGRAM	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT	AMOUNT
---	-------	UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION- USMC RDT&E	---	---	-11,000	-11,000	---
---	-------	UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION	---	---	-916,480	-916,480	---
		TOTAL, NAVY RDT&E	10,076,939	10,586,800	-1,095,822	9,490,978	10,603,599

SHIP PROPULSION SYSTEM/RACER

The administration requested $22.474 million for the Ship Propulsion System program, which includes $7.474 million for development of RACER.

For a variety of operational and economic reasons, the contractor and the Navy have reached an agreement to end this program.

The committee recommends authorization of $15.0 million for the ship propulsion system program, which deletes all funding for RACER. Further, the committee recommends bill language repealing the legislative requirement that the lead ship in the ARLEIGH BURKE (DDG-51) class be capable of accommodating RACER without major rearrangement of ship spaces or equipment.

ADVANCED AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE

The administration requested $42.4 million for research, development, test and evaluation of the Navy's Advanced Air-to-Surface Missile. Of this request, $37.5 million is intended for development of the Standoff Land Attack Missile (SLAM). The SLAM system will employ existing components to provide A-6E and F/A-18 aircraft with a precision guided stand-off air-to-surface capability. Primary components for the SLAM include the Harpoon missile, IIR Maverick/Seeker, and Global Positioning System.

The committee strongly endorses this effort to develop an effective, affordable, stand-off land attack weapon system.

SURFACE MINE COUNTERMEASURES

The administration requested $22.678 million for the Navy's surface mine countermeasures program. A portion of this funding is allocated to a "pre-planned product improvement" program for equipment already scheduled for installation on MCM-1 and MSH-1 class ships.

The committee recommends a reduced level of support for these P3I programs, since the Navy has encountered serious difficulties in executing the current MCM and MSH programs.

The committee recommends authorization of $14.678 million for the surface mine countermeasures program, a reduction of $8 million.

SURFACE ASW SYSTEMS

The committee observes that two of the Navy's RDT&E programs for anti-submarine warfare, Surface ASW (program element 63553) and Surface ASW system improvement (program element 64713), are managed by different offices.

The committee recommends to the Navy that management of these programs be consolidated. Since the committee has recommended a significant undistributed reduction in the Navy's RDT&E account, a specific reduction has not been recommended against these programs.

ALWT (ADVANCED)

The administration requested $7.434 million for the ALWT (Advanced) program, which would examine possible improvements to the Mark-50 Advanced Lightweight Torpedo soon to enter production.

The committee recommends that no funds be authorized for this program. While the committee supports development of new and better undersea weapons, the committee does not presently support a preplanned product improvement (P3I) program for the Mark-50 torpedo.

MERCHANT SHIP NAVAL AUXILIARY PROGRAM

The administration requested $6.014 million for the Navy's Merchant Ship Naval Auxiliary program.

The benefits from continued funding for this program are not clear. Moreover, another program, the Container Offload and Transfer System (COTS), is developing devices and techniques to use merchant ships and to move cargo from ship to shore.

The committee recommends no funds be authorized for the Merchant Ship Naval Auxiliary program.

PENGUIN/LAMPS

The administration requested $19.712 million for the Navy's LAMPS program. This program funds modifications to the LAMPS Mark-III system, including those necessary to accommodate the Mark-50 torpedo. It also funds development, testing, and installation of the Penguin anti-ship missile, in selected SH-60B (LAMPS Mk III) helicopters.

Penguin is a Norwegian designed, infra-red homing, anti-ship missile which would provide LAMPS MK-III helicopters with a capability to attack ships and surfaced submarines.

The Committee believes that in today's funding climate, Penguin is a program whose costs ($112.7 million) exceed its marginal benefits. Integration costs for Penguin have almost doubled ($36.0M to $66.0M) and the entire program will convert only 33 ships and 28 helicopters to employ the missile. Each ship will store only 4 missiles. Moreover, each helicopter will carry only one Penguin. That single missile will afford too low a probability of ship kill to warrant risking the helicopter against modern shipboard AAW defenses. Finally, the FFG-7 class ships scheduled to receive Penguin capable helicopters already have the 60 mile range Harpoon anti-ship missile. Penguin, with its 20 mile range, would only marginally enhance those ship's warfighting capability.

The committee recommends authorization of $3.994 million for the LAMPS program. No funds are provided for Penguin. Remaining funds provided for Penguin should be used for helicopter modifications necessary to accommodate the Mark-50 torpedo.

Further discussion of the Penguin missile is included in the discussion on NATO cooperation within the general provisions section.

P-3 MODERNIZATION

The administration requested $96.877 million for the P-3 modernization program. This includes $70.393 million for development of Update IV avionics and $19.667 million for initial development of a new P-3G aircraft.

The P-3G would be based on the P-3C design, but would include new engines for reduced maintenance and improved fuel efficiency. The new airframe would also include enhanced survivability features.

This program to improve the P-3's airframe and engines is separate from the Update IV avionics project, which has a more direct effect on anti-submarine warfare capability. Update IV avionics equipment will be fitted on all P-3Cs, so the P-3G project is not critical to the Update IV avionics project.

The committee recommends authorization of $77.210 million for the P-3 modernization program. This deletes all funding for the P-3G project. The committee strongly supports the Update IV avionics project as essential for modernization of the Navy's overall ASW capability. But, the committee believes the current P-3C airframe is fully adequate to the missions assigned and therefore regards the P-3G as a lower priority initiative which is unaffordable under current budget constraints.

V-22A OSPREY

The administration requested $386.9 million for the development of a tilt rotor, vertical take-off and landing (VTOL) aircraft. The V-22A OSPREY is intended to meet the amphibious/vertical assault needs of the Marine Corps, the combat search and rescue (SAR) requirements as well as the follow-on anti-submarine warfare (ASW) requirements of the Navy, and the special operations requirements of the Air Force. Once developed, the V-22A may also be procured by the Army to meet medium lift requirements. The V-22A will replace the CH-46 and CH-53A/D in the Marine Corps, the HH-3A in the Navy, and will supplement the HH-53, HH-60, and C-130 aircraft in the Air Force. In addition to the 1,200 (or more) V-22A's expected to be procured by the military, the committee anticipates broad commercial interest in the aircraft.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request for the development of the V-22A.

MARK-92 FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM UPGRADE

The committee recommends that no funds be authorized for the Mark-92 Fire Control System upgrade, since this program has been terminated during the Navy's review of the fiscal year 1988 budget.

ROLLING AIRFRAME MISSILE

The committee believes further development of the Rolling Airframe Missile (RAM) should cease.

This program is behind schedule and over budget. The Navy currently has a $39 million reprogramming request outstanding to cover past cost growth. Moreover, the missile has been plagued by continuing reliability and quality assurance problems.

Of further concern, the RAM design is not adequate to cover the full range of threats from anti-ship cruise missiles. RAM's effectiveness depends on a cooperative (radiating) target and RAM, therefore, is not capable against passive (IR/RF) homing anti-ship missiles. The Soviet inventory of passive homing missiles is substantial and projected to grow.

Given RAM's cost growth and design deficiencies, the committee recommends no funds be authorized for Rolling Airframe Missile development or production. As an alternative, the committee recommends authorization of $2 million to upgrade ship point defenses.

Further discussion of the Rolling Airframe Missile is included in the discussion on NATO cooperation.

SEAFIRE

The administration requested $21.156 million for the Navy's SAL-GP/EO Sensor program, which includes $4.924 million for the Seafire project.

Seafire is a gunfire control system for surface ships which includes an infrared device for viewing objects during low visibility and an infrared laser for illuminating targets for attack by guided projectiles.

The projected procurement cost for Seafire exceeds the threshold prescribed in last year's conference report on the Department of Defense authorization act. Alternative gunfire control systems are available, as well as other laser illuminators for use with guided projectiles.

The committee recommends authorization of $16.232 million for the SAL-GP/EO Sensor program. This recommendation deletes all funding for the Seafire project, which should be terminated.

F/A-18 SQUADRONS

The administration requested $59.1 million for the development of improvements or modifications to correct fleet reported deficiencies, and to expand the capabilities of the F/A-18 Hornet. This program includes the continued development of an austere, all-weather attack capability for the F/A-18. The committee strongly supports this effort.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request of $59.1 million for F/A-18 Squadrons.

NAVAL OCEANOGRAPHY PROGRAM

Last year, in recognition of the significant changes in the Soviet submarine threat and the need for increased performance of our antisubmarine warfare (ASW) sensors and systems, the Committee authorized the initial investment for a new, 5-year Navy research and development program called Naval Oceanography.

The long-term goal of the Naval Oceanography Program is to provide a capability to predict the three-dimensional acoustic field on a regional and local basis, incorporating information from remote sensing, ocean modeling, and detailed bathymetric data. The need to have a superior understanding of the ocean environment is vital in order to conduct effective ASW against an improving Soviet submarine force, and the key is a steady, continuing funding for oceanography programs.

The Committee recommends authorization of $3,000,000 for continuation of this important research activity.

MARINE CORPS RDT&E UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION

The committee recommends an undistributed reduction of $11.0 million against Marine Corps research, development, test & evaluation programs. This reduction is made to comply with overall budget constraints.

UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION

The committee recommends an undistributed reduction of $916.48 million against the Navy RDT&E account, to comply with budget limitations.

In a departure from past practice, specific reductions have been levied against only those line items which the committee believes warrant lower levels of support. Where additional reductions were necessary to meet budget targets, they were applied in the form of lump sum, undistributed reductions. This will permit service leaders, who are better qualified to make such judgments, to allocate the undistributed reduction across the RDT&E account in accordance with military and budgetary priorities.

REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE AND BASE OPERATION SUPPORT

Public Law 99-190, the 1986 Defense Appropriations Act, directed that the RDT&E costs of real property maintenance and base operations support for Navy RDT&E facilities for fiscal year 1987 be set aside in separate budget line numbers/accounts. The Navy did not comply with this direction for fiscal year 1987. Therefore, there are no line item authorizations for these accounts for the Navy.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL	FY 87 REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION
					CHANGE FROM REQUEST	RECOMMENDATION	
			AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT
1	61101F	IN HOUSE LAB INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	16,000	17,465		17,465	19,741
2	61102F	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	206,143	212,587		212,587	213,860
3	61103F	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	6,250	12,530		12,530	25,000
4	62101F	GEOPHYSICS	39,429	40,625		40,625	42,128
5	62102F	MATERIALS	53,235	57,478		57,478	60,150
6	62201F	AEROSPACE FLIGHT DYNAMICS	68,749	70,281		70,281	72,614
7	62202F	AEROSPACE BIOTECHNOLOGY	48,136	53,371		53,371	55,447
8	62203F	AEROSPACE PROPULSION	63,297	65,552		65,552	68,415
9	62204F	AEROSPACE AVIONICS	71,204	67,826		67,826	78,083
10	62205F	TRAINING/SIMULATION TECH	25,435	26,802		26,802	28,196
11	62206F	CIVIL ENGINEERING & INVIRONMENTAL QA	9,225	5,425		5,425	5,916
12	62302F	ROCKET PROPULSION	40,066	41,890		41,890	43,945
13	62601F	ADVANCED WEAPONS	36,202	37,070		37,070	38,366
14	62602F	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	41,230	49,884		49,884	49,634
15	62702F	COMMAND/CONTROL/COMMUNICATION	78,330	79,678		79,678	82,226
16	62703F	PERS UTILIZATION TECH	8,556	9,806		9,806	10,221
		UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION	---	---	-78,585	-78,585	---
		SUBTOTAL, TECHNOLOGY BASE	811,487	848,270	-78,585	769,685	893,942
17	63106F	LOGISTICS RESEARCH & DEV RQMTS	9,488	19,061		19,061	29,069
18	63109F	INTEGRATED EW SYSTEM ADV DEVELOPMENT	43,853	60,107		60,107	31,954
19	63202F	ACFT PROPULSION SUBSYS INTEGRATION	26,693	30,180		30,180	31,225
20	63203F	ADV AVIONICS FOR ACFT	21,028	49,835		49,835	43,925
21	63205F	FLT VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY	19,441	27,557		27,557	24,259
22	63208F	RECON SENSORS/PROCESSING TECHNOLOGY	5,821	6,064		6,064	7,925
23	63211F	AEROSPACE STRUCTURES/MATERIALS	18,084	31,512		31,512	32,599
24	63215F	AVIATION TURBINE FUEL TECHNOLOGY	7,952	10,432		10,432	11,129

					COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION		
LINE NO	PROGRAM ELEMENT	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL AMOUNT	FY 87 REQUEST AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT	FY 88 PROJECTION AMOUNT
25	63216F	ADV TURBINE ENGINE GAS GENERATOR	26,933	27,838		27,838	26,999
26	63217F	WEAPON SYSTEM POWER	1,235	3,544		3,544	6,440
27	63226F	DOD COMMON PROG LANGUAGE(ADA)ADV DEV	7,270	6,890		6,890	6,503
28	63227F	ADVANCED SIMULATOR TECHNOLOGY	4,297	5,054		5,054	6,409
29	63231F	CREW SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	11,207	15,905		15,905	12,309
30	63244F	ACFT NON NUCLEAR SURVIVABILITY	3,191	2,470		2,470	3,591
31	63245F	ADV FIGHTER TECH INTEGRATION	19,203	30,679		30,679	28,741
32	63250F	LINCOLN LABORATORY	23,000	26,524		26,524	28,208
33	63253F	ADVANCED SYSTEM INTEGRATION DEMO	0	9,369		9,369	6,708
34	63259F	CARTOG APPLICATIONS TAC & STRAT SYS	1,373	1,706		1,706	1,803
35	63269F	NATIONAL AEROSPACE PLANE TECHNOLOGY	0	33,490		33,490	84,512
36	63302F	SPACE & MSL ROCKET PROPULSION	3,295	12,911		12,911	16,477
37	63319F	ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY CRUISE MISSILE	7,482	0		0	0
38	63363F	HYPERVELOCITY MISSILE	10,456	9,609		9,609	11,972
39	63401F	ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECH	6,821	14,373		14,373	19,815
40	63410F	SPACE SYS ENVIRON INTERACTIONS TECH	3,854	8,529		8,529	7,006
41	63424F	CRUISE MISSILE SURVEILLANCE TECH	11,255	16,850		16,850	26,625
42	63452F	VERY HIGH SPEED INTEGRATED CIRCUITS	201,994	132,897		132,897	29,548
43	63601F	CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS	24,856	30,903		30,903	27,672
44	63605F	ADVANCED RADIATION TECH	23,449	23,641		23,641	22,918
45	63704F	MANPOWER & PERSONNEL SYS TECH	2,143	2,370		2,370	2,491
46	63707F	WEATHER SYSTEMS	3,375	3,697		3,697	4,102
47	63718F	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	25,540	0		0	0
48	63723F	CIVIL/ENVIRONMENTAL ENGR TECH	13,692	13,703		13,703	13,591
49	63726F	FIBER OPTICS DEVLOPMENT	3,373	2,841		2,841	3,824
50	63727F	ADVANCED COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	4,770	1,926		1,926	1,448
51	63728F	ADVANCED COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY	7,309	10,491		10,491	10,637
52	63743F	ELECTRO OPTICAL WARFARE	13,915	53,363		53,363	50,469
53	63745F	CHEMICAL WARFARE DEFENSE	4,873	5,149		5,149	3,833
54	63750F	COUNTER/COUNTERMEASURES -ADV DEV	13,057	7,612		7,612	8,426
55	63751F	TRAINING SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	2,264	2,411		2,411	2,432
56	63752F	DOD SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE	11,443	9,541		9,541	14,328

			FY 86 FINAL	FY 87 REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION
					CHANGE FROM REQUEST	RECOMMENDATION	
LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT	PROGRAM	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT
57	63789F	COMD/CNTRL/COMM ADV DEV	15,858	22,963		22,963	25,582
	-------	UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION	---	---	-31,620	-31,620	---
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED TECH DEVELOPMENT	665,143	783,997	-31,620	752,377	727,504
58	63258F	COMMON STRATEGIC ROTARY LAUNCHER	0	0		0	0
59	63311F	ADVANCED STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS	159,756	176,915		176,915	184,515
60	63312F	ADVANCED CONCEPTS	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
61	63364F	SHORT RANGE ATTACK MISSILE II	34,108	164,702	-45,000	119,702	250,403
62	63367F	STRATEGIC RELOCATABLE TARGET CAPABIL	0	985		985	1,572
63	63368F	AIR DEFENSE BATTLE MGT TECH	0	2,500		2,500	10,500
64	63369F	CRUISE MISSILE ENGAG SYS TECH	0	2,100		2,100	13,500
65	63716F	ATMOSPHERIC SURVEILANCE TECH	4,851	32,024		32,024	30,604
66	63735F	WWMCCS ARCHITECTURE	7,831	2,224		2,224	2,525
67	64221F	SPECIAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS	0	0		0	0
68	64226F	B-1B	271,640	118,652		118,652	28,948
69	64234F	COMMON STRATEGIC ROTARY LAUNCHER	70,778	14,591		14,591	5,832
70	64312F	ICBM MODERNIZATION	1,442,271	2,116,798	-918,000	1,198,798	2,733,726
		MX		(352,300)	(-30,000)	(-322,300)	
		SICBM		(1,375,500)	(-700,000)	(-675,500)	
		BASING		(388,900)	(-188,000)	(-200,900)	
71	64326F	STRAT CONV STANDOFF CAPA(SCSC)	35,083	7,464		7,464	0
72	64361F	AIR LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE	10,894	6,065		6,065	3,703
73	64406F	SPACE DEFENSE SYS	199,500	277,957	-61,800	216,157	226,217
74	64711F	SYSTEMS SURVIVABILITY (NUC AFFECTS)	7,725	13,515		13,515	19,650
75	11113F	B-52 SQUADRONS	12,829	0		0	0
76	11120F	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
77	11135F	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY ENHANCEMENTS	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
78	11142F	KC-135 SQUADRONS	944	3,941		3,941	4,153
79	11213F	MINUTEMAN SQUADRONS	5,511	67,526	-13,000	54,526	221,921
80	11312F	PACCS/WWABNCP SYS EC-135 CL V MODS	3,993	14,798		14,798	28,045
81	11316F	SAC COMMUNICATIONS	7,396	610		610	0
82	12310F	NCMC TW/AA SYSTEMS	51,108	32,935		32,935	72,527

LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL	FY 87 REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION
					CHANGE FROM REQUEST	RECOMMENDATION	
			AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT
83	12311F	NCMC SPACE DEFENSE SYSTEMS	56,518	41,284		41,284	23,974
84	12313F	BALLISTIC MSL TAC WNG/ATK ASSES SYS	2,100	3,084		3,084	2,878
85	12323F	TW/AA INTERFACE NETWORK	1,430	0		0	0
86	12325F	JOINT SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	2,017	3,509		3,509	2,279
87	12411F	SURVEILL RADAR STATIONS/SITES	19,700	25,004		25,004	15,527
88	12412F	DEW RADAR STATIONS	39,871	14,430		14,430	6,744
89	12417F	OVER THE HORIZON RADAR	65,738	33,877		33,877	46,525
90	12423F	BALLISTIC MSL EARLY WNG SYSTEM	12,636	16,225		16,225	22,746
91	12424F	SPACETRACK	9,368	16,461		16,461	14,264
92	12431F	DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM	77,540	138,178	-13,178	125,000	95,429
93	12432F	SLBM RADAR WARNING SYSTEMS	8,025	19,752		19,752	20,728
94	12433F	INTEGRATED OPER NUDETS DETECT SYS	20,015	31,346		31,346	9,717
95	12436F	COMD CTR PROCESS/DISPLAY SYS	14,430	27,027		27,027	24,789
96	12822F	LEO	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
97	32015F	NEACP/E 4B CL V MODS	0	0		0	0
98	33131F	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMER COMM NETWORK	99,526	92,527		92,527	57,947
99	33152F	WWMCCS INFORMATION SYSTEM	4,873	8,510		8,510	9,591
100	33154F	WWMCCS INFORMATION SYSTEM - JPMO	62,097	111,374	-11,374	100,000	85,633
101	33601F	MILSTAR SAT COMM SYS (AF TERMINALS)	124,254	298,527	-8,527	290,000	291,272
102	33603F	MILSTAR COMM SAT SYSTEM	336,886	493,357	-25,000	468,357	[ ]
103	35155F	THEATER NUC WPN STORAGE&SEC SYS	1,018	0		0	0
104	35172F	BERNIE	[ ]	[ ]	+9,500	9,500	[ ]
105	35892F	SPECIAL ANALYSIS ACTIVITIES	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
106	41123F	MILITARY AIRLIFT GROUP (IF)	19,490	8,963		8,963	12,677
		CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	2,053,856	2,636,868		2,636,868	3,422,657
		SUBTOTAL, STRATEGIC PROGRAMS	5,357,606	7,076,605	-1,105,379	5,971,226	8,003,710
107	63230F	ADVANCED TACTICAL FIGHTER	164,628	294,099		294,099	343,520
108	63239F	UNMANNED AIR RECONNAISSANCE VEHICLE	9,745	3,940		3,940	0
103	63256F	CV 22A	2,429	4,920		4,920	4,800
110	63307F	AIR BASE SURVIVABILITY & RECOVERY	4,863	7,078		7,078	5,509
111	63320F	LOW COST SEEKER	17,109	14,775		14,775	15,723

LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL AMOUNT	FY 87 REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION FY 88 PROJECTION AMOUNT
112	63437F	HAVE DJINN	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
113	63607F	F-4 MODERNIZATION DEMOSTRATION	14,518	0		0	0
114	63609F	MILLIMETER WAVE SEEKERS	18,567	14,179		14,179	4,638
115	63714F	DOD PHYSICAL SECURITY EQ EXTERIOR	985	984		984	331
116	63717F	TECHNICAL ON-SITE INSPECTION (TOSI)	0	9,850		9,850	3,931
117	63742F	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY	8,528	6,314		6,314	0
118	63749F	C3CM ADVANCED SYSTEMS	1,949	4,512		4,512	1,478
119	63770F	JT SURV.TGT ATK RADAR SYS(JSTARS)	3,118	0		0	0
120	63801F	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
120	63801F	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	[ ]	[ ]	20,000	20,000	[ ]
121	64201F	ACFT AVIONICS EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	28,383	25,092		25,092	23,935
122	64209F	F-100 DURABILITY	2,825	0		0	0
123	64212F	AIRCRAFT EQUIPMENT DEV	8,516	4,862		4,862	7,780
124	64218F	ENGINE MODEL DERIVATIVE PROG	60,606	68,132		68,132	3,156
125	64219F	INTEGRATED DIGITAL AVIONICS	8,000	13,394		13,394	276
126	64220F	EW COUNTER RESPONSE	29,202	34,068		34,068	4,041
127	64222F	NUCLEAR WEAPONS SUPPORT	1,983	4,341	-2,000	2,341	4,537
128	64223F	ALTERNATE FIGHTER ENGINE	32,482	109,376		109,376	89,393
129	64231F	C-17 PROGRAM	372,759	612,262	-65,000	547,262	901,922
130	64232F	PAVE RUNNER	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
131	64236F	INFRARED SEARCH & TRACK SYS	23,054	34,846		34,846	43,462
132	64247F	MODULAR AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT	9,683	23,682		23,682	26,459
133	64249F	NIGHT PRECISION ATTACK	39,793	40,103		40,103	20,429
134	64250F	INTEGRATED EW/CNI DEVELOPMENT	0	0		0	5,835
135	64268F	ACFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVE PROG	121,728	141,776		141,776	141,306
136	64302F	DEF SUPPRESSION WPNS ENG DEV	0	0		0	0
137	64313F	T-46A	52,812	10,756	-10,756	0	11,714
138	64314F	ADV MED RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MSL	101,291	39,080		39,080	13,013
139	64315F	ADV SHORT RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE	0	386		386	865
140	64321F	JOINT TACTICAL FUSION PROGRAM	3,720	24,661		24,661	[ ]
141	64327F	HARDENED TARGET MUNITIONS	0	15,115		15,115	15,353
142	64362F	GRD LAUNCHED CRUISE MSL	667	7,377		7,377	0
143	64601F	C/B DEFENSE EQUIPMENT	21,915	27,187		27,187	27,623

LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL	FY 87 REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION
					CHANGE FROM REQUEST	RECOMMENDATION	
			AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT
144	64602F	ARMAMENT ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	17,116	29,773		29,773	25,235
145	64604F	SUBMUNITIONS	37,919	4,921		4,921	4,767
146	64607F	WIDE AREA ANTI-ARMOR MUNITION	12,238	15,102		15,102	18,120
147	64617F	AIR BASE SURVIVABILITY & RECOVERY	19,393	21,330		21,330	19,799
148	64703F	AEROMEDICAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	7,844	9,341		9,341	8,873
149	64706F	LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM	15,272	12,396		12,396	20,432
150	64708F	OTHER OPERATIONAL EQUIPMENT	17,507	14,469		14,469	9,869
151	64710F	RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT	7,621	9,540		9,540	10,200
152	64715F	DOD PHYSICAL SECURITY EQ-EXTERIOR	15,332	18,511		18,511	11,758
153	64724F	TAC C3 COUNTER-MEASURES	29,661	24,636		24,636	16,363
154	64725F	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION SYSTEMS	12,828	12,012		12,012	29,494
155	64733F	SURFACE DEF SUPRESSION	29,235	44,119		44,119	34,182
156	64737F	AIRBORNE SELF PROTECTION JAMMER	5,000	10,071		10,071	0
157	64738F	PROTECTIVE SYSTEMS	50,115	92,705		92,705	72,390
158	64739F	TACTICAL PROTECTIVE SYSTEMS	43,789	94,910		94,910	95,004
159	64740F	COMPUTER RESOURCES MGT TECH	11,705	12,957		12,957	18,689
160	64742F	PRECISION LOCATION STRIKE SYSTEM	61,474	26,601	-26,601	0	11,136
161	64750F	INTELLIGENCE EQUIPMENT	13,138	10,417		10,417	7,091
162	64753F	COMBAT HELICOPTER MODERNIZATION	9,745	0		0	0
163	64754F	JT TAC INFO DIST SYS	0	0		0	0
164	64756F	SIDE LOOKING AIRBORNE RADAR (SLAR)	23,440	19,691		19,691	19,278
165	64770F	JSTARS	0	355,692		355,692	335,516
166	64779F	JT INTEROPERABILITY TAC COMD/CNTRL	8,908	9,866		9,866	6,218
167	11133F	SR 71 SQUADRONS	[ ]	[ ].		[ ]	[ ]
168	21131F	US READINESS COMD - COMM	0	0		0	4,913
169	27129F	F 111 SQUADRONS	23,627	17,618		17,618	13,921
169	27129F	F 111 SQUADRONS	23,626	17,618		17,618	13,921
170	27130F	F 15 SQUADRONS	229,993	208,988		208,988	106,473
171	27131F	A 10 SQUADRONS	3,014	0		0	0
172	27133F	F 16 SQUADRONS	66,270	81,323		81,323	42,718
173	27136F	F 4G WILD WEASEL SQUADRONS	35,740	38,698		38,698	23,278
174	27137F	CONSTANT HELP	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
175	27139F	COMPETITIVE FIGHTER PROCUREMENT	0	0		0	27,516

					COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION		
LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL AMOUNT	FY 87 REQUEST AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT	FY 88 PROJECTION AMOUNT
176	27162F	TACTICAL ACM MISSILES	1,943	2,377		2,377	2,398
177	27168F	F 111 SELF PROTECTION SYSTEMS	0	0		0	32,429
178	27215F	TR 1 SQUADRONS	0	23,509		23,509	33,897
179	27217F	FOLLOW ON TAC RECCE SYS	0	30,583		30,583	19,935
180	27247F	AIR FORCE TENCAP	244	105		105	320
181	27411F	OVERSEAS AIR WEAPON CONT SYS	3,014	8,534		8,534	10,906
182	27412F	TACTICAL AIR CONTROL SYSTEM	14,566	19,261		19,261	41,694
183	27417F	AIR BORNE WARNING & CONTROL SYS	118,762	137,190		137,190	117,842
184	27419F	TACTICAL AIRBORNE CMD & CONTROL SYS	7,943	0		0	0
185	27423F	ADV COMM SYS	100,786	33,335		33,335	30,437
186	27431F	TAC AIR INTELL SYS ACTYS	2,135	492		492	491
187	27435F	TACTICAL RECON IMAGERY EXPLOITATION	7,495	831		831	99
188	27584F	SEEK AXLE	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
189	27585F	SEEK SPINNER	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
190	27591F	OMEGA	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
191	27595F	BASE COMM TACTICAL AIR FORCES	862	3,207		3,207	3,245
192	28010F	JT TACTICAL COMM PROG (TRI TAC)	4,776	11,425		11,425	13,349
193	28042F	HAVE FLAG	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
194	33605F	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS TERMINALS	4,814	4,615		4,615	4,464
195	35887F	ELECTRONIC COMBAT INTEL SPT	1,552	1,784		1,784	1,673
196	41115F	C 130 AIRLIFT SQUADRONS (IF)	0	0		0	0
197	41129F	HAVE FLAG	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
198	41314F	OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AIRLIFT	0	0		0	269
199	41840F	MAC COMMAND/CONTROL SYS	7,741	22,712	-10,000	12,712	16,139
200	44011F	SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES	9,745	66,539		66,539	68,373
201	52610F	A 7 SQUADRONS (ANG/A 7 STRIKEFIGHTER)	0	4,531	35,000	39,531	5,056
		CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	419,138	723,023		723,023	634,136
		SUBTOTAL, TACTICAL PROGRAMS	2,723,024	3,904,505	59,357	3,845,148	3,766,135

			FY 86 FINAL	FY 87 REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION
LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT	PROGRAM			CHANGE FROM REQUEST	RECOMMENDATION	
			AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT
202	63260F	INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	0	6,081	-2,081	4,000	7,790
203	63261F	PAVE RUNNER ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
204	63431F	SPACE COMMUNICATIONS	41,916	35,805	-10,000	25,805	37,021
205	64238F	CONSTANT PISCES	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
206	64778F	NAVSTAR GPS USER EQUIPMENT	0	0		0	0
207	27169F	SEEK CLOCK	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
208	27582F	HAVE TRUMP	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
209	31305F	INTELLIGENCE PRODUCTION ACTIVITIES	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
210	31310F	FOREIGN TECHNOLOGY DIVISION	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
211	31314F	INFRARED PROCESSING AND EXPLOITATION	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
212	31315F	MISSILE AND SPACE TECH COLLECTION	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
213	31317F	SENIOR YEAR OPERATIONS	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
214	31324F	FOREST GREEN	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
215	31357F	INTEG OPERATIONAL NUDETS DETECTION SYSTE	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
216	32053F	NMCS-WIDE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS	0	1,970	-1,970	0	0
217	33110F	DEF SATELLITE COMM SYS	6,753	14,001		14,001	12,531
218	33126F	LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS (DCS)	11,249	5,630		5,630	5,264
219	33128F	I-S/A AMPE SYSTEM	30,600	54,567		54,567	9,336
220	33144F	ELECTROMAG COMPATIBILITY ANAL CTR	7,256	7,670		7,670	8,067
221	33401F	COMMUNICATIONS SECURITY	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
222	34111F	SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	1,738,619	1,793,491		1,793,491	[ ]
223	35114F	TRAFFIC CNTRL/APPROACH/LANDING SYS	23,913	18,575		18,575	5,098
224	35159F	DEFENSE RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT ACTIVITIE	[ ]	[ ]	-5,800	-5,800	[ ]
225	35164F	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POS SYS (USER EQ)	27,960	45,024		45,024	52,650
226	35165F	NAVSTAR GPS (SPACE/GRD SEGMENTS)	44,365	44,362		44,362	45,592
227	84733F	GEN INTELLIGENCE SKILL TNG	5,165	4,788		4,788	4,367
		CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	305,912	508,777		508,777	2,160,094
		SUBTOTAL, INTELLIGENCE & COMMUNICATIONS	2,243,708	2,540,741	-19,851	2,520,890	2,347,810
228	63248F	CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT	2,000	3,214		3,214	4,881
229	63402F	SPACE TEST PROGRAM	66,690	73,692	-30,000	43,692	83,730
230	63438F	SATELLITE SYS SURVIVABILITY	4,164	5,405		5,405	11,677

					COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION		
			FY 86 FINAL	FY 87 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	RECOMMENDATION	FY 88 PROJECTION
LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT	PROGRAM	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT
231	63790F	NATO COOPERATIVE R&D	25,000	49,249		49,249	0
232	64211F	ADV AERIAL TARGETS DEV	13,119	11,149		11,149	11,422
233	64227F	FLIGHT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	128,436	102,736		102,736	62,351
234	64237F	VARIABLE IN-FLT TEST ACFT (VISTA)	381	8,680		8,680	14,431
235	64411F	SPACE SHUTTLE	128,642	0		0	0
236	64609F	R&M MATURATION/TECH INSERTION	6,578	18,031		18,031	23,594
237	64707F	WEATHER SYSTEMS	7,872	8,444		8,444	8,187
238	64735F	RANGE IMPROVEMENT	52,624	64,616		64,616	73,857
239	64747F	ELECTROMAG RADIATION TEST FACIL	3,290	5,686		5,686	6,268
240	64755F	IMPROVED CAPABILITY FOR RDT+E	45,234	89,518		89,518	78,256
241	65101F	PROJECT AIR FORCE	18,245	18,295	2,705	21,000	18,858
242	65304F	ACQ/COMD SPT - TELECOM	6,550	10,987		10,987	9,930
243	65306F	RANCH HAND II EPIDEMIOLOGY STUDY	4,699	7,384		7,384	4,901
244	65502F	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION DEV	0	0		0	0
245	65708F	NAV/RADAR/SLED TRACK TEST SPT	20,671	25,889		25,889	26,652
246	65806F	ACQUISITION AND COMMAND SUPPORT	356,520	285,063		285,063	308,865
247	65807F	TEST AND EVALUATION SPT	426,686	304,151		304,151	312,042
248	65808F	ADV SYS ENGINEERING/PLAN	17,000	23,144		23,144	26,212
249	65863F	RDT&E AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	55,547	62,404		62,404	60,961
250	65872F	PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENTS	2,932	5,106		5,106	0
251	65874F	PRODUCT PERFORMANCE AGMT CNTR(PPAC)	0	1,157		1,157	1,250
252	65894F	REAL PROPERTY MAINT -RDT+E	0	140,310	-4,500	135,810	145,115
253	65896F	BASE OPERATIONS (RDT+E)	0	110,268	-3,400	106,868	113,618
254	35110F	SATELLITE CONTROL FACILITY	71,259	91,714		91,714	114,794
255	35119F	SPACE BOOSTERS	215,751	138,690		138,690	118,310
256	35130F	CONSOLIDATED SPACE OPERATIONS CENTER	85,187	93,664	19,000	74,664	66,649
257	35160F	DEF METEOROLOGICAL SATELLITE PROG	54,874	63,772		63,772	60,532
258	35171F	SPACE SHUTTLE OPERATIONS	75,432	175,867	-50,000	125,867	226,621
259	38610F	INFORMATION MGMT AUTOMATION PROG	0	0		0	673
260	71112F	INVENTORY CONTROL POINT OPERATIONS	2,924	4,788		4,788	4,438
261	72207F	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON IF)	0	487		487	6,734
262	78011F	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	62,895	83,573		83,573	68,833
263	78026F	PRODUCT/RELIABLE/AVAIL/MAINTAIN PROG	13,999	31,405		31,405	39,198

					COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION		
LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL AMOUNT	FY 87 REQUEST AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT	FY 88 PROJECTION AMOUNT
264	78031F	LOGISTICS C3I SYSTEM	8,283	0		0	0
265	91215F	PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENTS	0	0		0	962
266	92998F	MANAGEMENT HQS ADP SUPPORT (AF)	0	0		0	0
267	01004F	INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES	2,956	2,744		2,744	3,128
		UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION	---	---	-57,295	-57,295	---
		SUBTOTAL, DEFENSEWIDE MISSION SUPPORT	1,986,440	2,121,282	-161,490	1,959,792	2,117,930
		UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION	---	---	-517,110	517,110	
		CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	---	[ ]	-335	-335	---
		TOTAL, AIR FORCE RDT&E	13,787,408	17,275,400	-1,973,727	15,301,673	17,857,039

GROUND COLLISION AVOIDANCE EQUIPMENT

A recent "near miss" which almost resulted in the loss of a Navy DC-9 aircraft (through ground collision) while operating in instrument conditions in controlled airspace has underscored the importance of equipping such aircraft with advanced ground proximity warning systems. The committee strongly supports the use of such systems to improve military aviation safety. The committee notes that while the cost of systems such as the second generation Ground Proximity Warning System (GPWS) is relatively modest when compared to the cost of a major transport aircraft, not all such aircraft are equipped with modern ground collision avoidance systems.

The committee therefore directs the Navy and Air Force to initiate reprogramming actions using prior year funds as necessary to procure modern ground collision avoidance systems for those special mission aircraft which are not so equipped. The committee further recommends that each of the Services include in their fiscal year 1988-1992 budget requests those funds necessary to equip all passenger carrying aircraft with advanced ground collision avoidance systems.

HYPERVELOCITY/KINETIC ENERGY WEAPON

The administration requested $9.6 million for advanced development of the hypervelocity/kinetic energy weapon. The hypervelocity/kinetic energy weapon is intended to be a small, low-cost, air-to-surface or surface-to-surface guided missile system designed to destroy armored vehicles.

The committee strongly endorses efforts of the Department of Defense to develop expeditiously the hypervelocity/kinetic energy weapon. The Defense Science Board recently completed a detailed study on U.S. armor and anti-armor capabilities, and concluded that an aggressive program is necessary to overcome U.S. armor and anti-armor deficiencies. The study noted the pivotal role hypervelocity/kinetic energy weapons could play in improving anti-armor capabilities of U.S. ground and air forces. The committee strongly concurs with the conclusions of the Defense Science Board and encourages the Department of Defense to assign the highest priority to the continued development of the hypervelocity/kinetic energy weapon.

The committee also believes that the hypervelocity/kinetic energy weapon is an excellent candidate for the streamlined acquisition approach recommended by the Packard Commission. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to take such steps as necessary to proceed with the hypervelocity/kinetic energy weapon under these expedited procedures. The committee recommends $9.6 million be authorized for the development of the hypervelocity/kinetic energy weapon.

ADVANCED STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS

The administration requested $176.9 million for research and development associated with the Advanced Strategic Missile System (ASMS) program in fiscal year 1987. The ASMS program is designed to maintain the penetration effectiveness of the U.S. ICBM force against conventional ballistic missile defense threats.

The activities being pursued in the program include the development of penetration aids for use on the Minuteman III, Peacekeeper, and small intercontinental ballistic missiles. In addition, work is ongoing to develop a maneuvering reentry vehicle (MARV) and terminal fix systems to insure the penetration capability and effectiveness of U.S. ballistic missiles against traditional but more capable ballistic missile defense threats.

The committee continues to be very concerned by Soviet ballistic missile defense activities, including the continued construction of the Krasnoyarsk radar in violation of the 1972 ABM Treaty. Soviet activities indicate that they may be preparing an ABM defense of their national territory. In addition, certain Soviet surface-to-air missiles are assessed to have capability against some U.S. ballistic missiles. As a result of these disturbing developments, the Soviets would be able to rapidly break-out of the ABM Treaty. In view of the need to maintain the effectiveness of our deterrent against such threats, the committee continues to view the ASMS program as a high priority.

Last year, the committee directed the ASMS program to produce systems that could be transferred into the U.S. ICBM force as soon as possible. The committee therefore commends the Air Force for transferring the penetration aid effort for the Minuteman III into development under the Minuteman Squadrons program. The committee encourages continued efforts to transfer these systems into the ICBM force, including the interface work required to facilitate the deployment of penetration aids on Peacekeeper.

In view of the high priority that the committee attaches to the ASMS program, it recommends authorization of the full amount requested in fiscal year 1987. The committee encourages the Air Force to continue with the development of a MARV system, including work on guidance and hardened electronics, as well as the development of the associated optical and radar penetration aids. In addition, in view of Soviet passive defense measures involving hardened and deeply buried targets, the committee views as a priority the development of an earth penetrating warhead (EPW) system. The Air Force is encouraged to give increased emphasis to these activities within the ASMS program.

SRAM II

The administration requested $164.7 million for research and development of the Short-Range Attack Missile II (SRAM II) program in fiscal year 1987. The administration's request provides for the initiation of full scale development of a modern replacement for the aging SRAM missiles currently in our inventory. SRAM II is being designed for deployment on B-1Bs and the Advanced Technology Bomber in the 1990s.

Due primarily to budget constraints, the committee recommends a reduction of $45.0 million from the amount requested. This will result in a delay of about three months in the start of engineering development, but will not adversely affect weapon availability under current bomber force planning assumptions.

The committee continues to be concerned about the total cost of the program, notwithstanding the report submitted by the administration in response to the fiscal year 1986 authorization conference report. The Air Force is encouraged to continue to examine options to provide the standoff targeting afforded by a SRAM missile that do not involve the several billion dollar program cost associated with a new missile. In addition, the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy are directed to employ a minimum modification variant of the W-80-1 Air Launched Cruise Missile warhead or another existing warhead for the SRAM II missile.

ICBM MODERNIZATION

The administration requested $1,418.0 million in procurement, and a total of $2,116.7 million for research and development associated with the ICBM Modernization program in fiscal year 1987. This program funds, among other things, the continued procurement of Peacekeeper missiles, research and development of the new small ICBM, and related follow-on basing activities.

Peacekeeper

The administration requested $352.3 million to continue development and testing of the Peacekeeper intercontinental ballistic missile, and to develop a second source for the Advanced Inertial Reference Sphere (AIRS) guidance system. In addition, $1,418.0 million was requested to procure 21 missiles for operational testing.

The committee again commends the Air Force for the extremely successful MX development and test program, which is on schedule to support an initial operational capability of ten missiles by the end of 1986. The committee, consistent with the fiscal year 1986 Defense Authorization Act, supports full funding of the 21 Peacekeeper missiles requested. Due to budgetary constraints, the committee recommends a reduction of $30.0 million in the research and development request associated with qualifying a second source for the AIRS guidance system.

The committee finds no reason to change in this Act the ceiling of 50 MX missiles deployed in Minuteman silos that was included in the fiscal year 1986 Defense Authorization Act. The committee reiterates that the MX missile program provision in the fiscal year 1986 Defense Authorization Act envisioned that additional MX deployments in other more survivable basing modes would require future Congressional approval.

Small ICBM

The administration requested $1,375.5 million in fiscal year 1987 for continued research and development of the Small ICBM (SICBM) program. This level of funding would permit the initiation of full scale development of a 30,000 to 37,000 pound missile during fiscal year 1987, and the start of flight testing in 1989. These program milestones would support a 1992 initial operational capability. Again, as in the case of the Peacekeeper program, the Air Force has conducted a model advanced development effort for the SICBM that has achieved impressive technical results through competition.

Last year, this committee raised a number of questions regarding the Small ICBM, and requested reports from the Department of Defense and from the Defense Science Board addressing these questions. The findings that have been reported to the Congress indicate that the Small ICBM in Hardened Mobile Launchers will be survivable against current and future Soviet threats. The reports also support the initiation of full-scale development in fiscal year 1987 pointing toward a 1992 initial operational capability. The findings further support an increase in the Congressionally mandated weight constraint to between 37,000 and 40,000 pounds in order to accommodate penetration aids and the capacity for future payload variations while maintaining sufficient mobility, although no testing was conducted by the Department or Board as to the effects of increased payload on mobility.

In the committee's view, the capability to carry penetration aids is essential in light of existing Soviet ballistic missile defense capabilities and the possibility of more extensive deployments. The committee also emphasizes the priority it places on maintaining the mobility of the Small ICBM system, including the desirability of its being able to operate both off-road and on-road, and to interface with public highways and other existing road networks in times of extreme crisis.

On the basis of these findings, the committee believes that the Air Force should continue the pre-full scale development work for a 37,000-40,000 pound Small ICBM system and other investigations related to and not inconsistent with the purposes of the DSARC, but does not believe that further expenditure of funds to support a 30,000 pound small missile and the related hard mobile launcher option is warranted.

The administration is now studying a number of SICBM related issues in preparation for the full scale development milestone. This review will serve as the basis for a recommendation to the President—in accordance with his May 27, 1986 decision on interim restraint, and his June 1986 Message to the Congress on Strategic Modernization—on an appropriate configuration for the Small ICBM in terms of weight, number of warheads, and production schedule.

In view of the significant constraints on the defense budget, the committee chose to give priority to those aspects of the strategic modernization program that would be fielded prior to 1990, at the expense of those systems that would be deployed after 1990. Accordingly, the committee recommends a reduction of $700.0 million in the research and development request for the Small ICBM, and directs that funding authorized for this purpose be subject to the restrictions described below. The committee continues to strongly support the alternative guidance system competition within the Small ICBM program as a means both to reduce costs and increase the system's operational flexibility.

Follow-On Basing

The administration also requested $388.9 million to continue follow-on basing research. These funds would allow the Department of Defense, following a down-select decision later this year, to carry one or more survivable basing modes for additional Peacekeeper missiles to the point of full scale development. Again, consistent with the rationale cited above, the committee recommends a reduction of $188.9 million in the amount requested for follow-on basing research.

ICBM Modernization Report

The committee has included bill language that would have the effect of fencing a portion of the funding authorized for Small ICBM and follow-on basing research until the Congress has an opportunity to review the recommendations of the Department of Defense and the decision of the President on the future course for these programs.

The committee expects that these recommendations and decisions will be presented to the Congress as an ICBM "roadmap" encompassing Small ICBM, MX, and MX survivable basing options, including the role of strategic defenses. This information, presented in the context of ballistic missile counterforce requirements, shall be provided in the annual report to the Congress on the ICBM Modernization program.

SPACE DEFENSE SYSTEM (ASAT)

The administration requested $278.0 million for research and development, and $28.5 million for advanced procurement associated with the Space Defense System (ASAT) program in fiscal year 1987. This funding request provides for continued development and testing of an antisatellite system that will be effective against low altitude targets. The U.S. ASAT system consists of a two stage missile with a miniature homing vehicle (MHV) warhead that is launched from a specially configured F-15 aircraft.

The fiscal year 1986 continuing resolution prohibited testing of the MHV ASAT system against objects in space, but placed no other limitations on the test program such as testing against celestial bodies. Nonetheless, this provision has the effect of seriously curtailing the development of a U.S. antisatellite capability. The Soviet Union possesses the world's only dedicated operational antisatellite system. That system may require no further testing to maintain its operational status. In addition, the Soviets have inherent antisatellite capabilities in some systems that are designed for other purposes. These systems provide the Soviets with the capability to degrade, damage, or destroy a number of high value United States satellites.

The existing moratorium on testing of the U.S. antisatellite system against objects in space prevents the United States from developing an ASAT capability comparable to that possessed by the Soviet Union. It grants the Soviet Union one of its principal arms control objectives without creating a framework for mutual and verifiable limitations. Therefore, the committee adopted bill language repealing the moratorium on ASAT testing against objects in space.

The committee continues to support the development and eventual deployment of a U.S. antisatellite capability. Such a capability would deny the Soviet Union a sanctuary in space from which to conduct hostile activities against United States and allied terrestrial forces. In addition, the development of an antisatellite capability is an important element of our efforts to enhance the survivability of our key space assets.

During the past year, the MHV ASAT program has been restructured to reduce the risk associated with the transition from development to procurement. This restructuring has included the addition of more development units, as well as producibility upgrades and increased testing. The committee supports this action, which is consistent with the programmatic recommendations contained in the fiscal year 1986 Defense Authorization Act. The committee recognizes that as a result of the increased cost of this restructured program, and due to a reduction in the total inventory objective, there has been an increase in the unit cost for the program.

The committee recommends that the research and development of the F-15 launched antisatellite system be funded at the requested level. $216.2 million is authorized for this purpose, and the committee directs the transfer of $61.8 million in fiscal year 1985 Space Defense System procurement funds into the research and development account. The committee recommends full funding of the request for advanced procurement.

MINUTEMAN SQUADRONS

The administration requested $175.3 million for procurement and $67.5 million for research and development associated with modifications to the Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missile force. The request for research and development includes funding to initiate engineering development of penetration aids for the Minuteman III missile, and to initiate a program to integrate Minuteman electronics.

The committee strongly supports this penetration aids initiative for Minuteman as an important counter against Soviet ABM capabilities that are already deployed, and as a hedge against the possibility of a more extensive Soviet ABM breakout. The committee has strongly supported Air Force activities to develop penetration aids to ensure the effectiveness of the U.S. ballistic missile force.

The Integrated Electronics initiative has two elements. One addresses the supportability (reliability and maintainability) of certain electronics components, and for this purpose full funding is recommended for authorization. The second element addresses the operational requirement for increased communications integration in the Minuteman Launch Control Facility (LCF). While the committee supports the rationale for this initiative, which is to provide for more efficiency in carrying out execution procedures, the total program has not been defined well enough to warrant funding at the requested level. Therefore, in view of budgetary constraints, the committee recommends a reduction of $13.0 million for this portion of the Minuteman modification program.

A reduction of $12.4 million dollars to the Minuteman Class IV and V Modifications line is also recommended. The committee understands that this reduction can be offset by prior year unobligated balances in this account, and by reduced fiscal year 1987 requirements based on information available after submission of the budget request.

MILSTAR

The administration requested $136.2 million for procurement and $796 million for research and development of the MILSTAR program in fiscal year 1987. The MILSTAR communications satellite program is designed to provide the National Command Authority with a survivable, jam-resistant and secure means to communicate with and control U.S. nuclear forces.

Due to budgetary considerations, the committee recommends a total reduction of $95.1 million from the MILSTAR program. $74.5 million is authorized for procurement, and $762.5 million for research and development. These reductions are distributed among the space segment, terminal development, E-4 modifications, and other procurement line elements, with the understanding that these adjustments will not affect the scheduled launch date for the first satellite.

ADVANCED TACTICAL FIGHTER (ATF)/ADVANCED TACTICAL AIRCRAFT (ATA)

The Air Force plans to develop the Advanced Tactical Fighter (ATF) as the next generation air superiority fighter to follow the F-15 Eagle. The Navy plans the development of the Advanced Tactical Aircraft (ATA) as the next generation medium attack aircraft to replace the A-6 Intruder. Major differences in mission requirements dictate significantly different designs for these two aircraft.

While the design features of an aircraft optimized for air superiority may be incompatible with those of an aircraft designed for interdiction and ground attack, there are no essential, service-peculiar requirements that would make an Air Force fighter unsuitable for Navy use or a Navy attack aircraft unsuitable for Air Force use. The additional structure required for Navy carrier operations (such as heavier landing gear, baffled fuel cells, stronger wing and keel design) may be accommodated in a variant of an Air Force fighter without compromising Air Force requirements. Similarly, the additional weight of a Navy aircraft (a penalty to the Air Force) may be designed out of an Air Force variant. By designing the aircraft to perform a limited number of similar missions, the difficulties encountered in previous joint aircraft development programs should be avoided. The failure of the TFX (F-111) to meet both Navy and Air Force requirements resulted not from trying to join too many services (Air Force and Navy) in one aircraft, but rather from trying to join too many (and some incompatible) missions in a single aircraft.

Budgetary constraints will prohibit the development of two new fighters (one Air Force, one Navy) and two new attack aircraft. In recognition of this fact, the Secretary of the Air Force and Secretary of the Navy signed a Memorandum of Understanding in March, 1986 in which they agreed to explore the possibilities for cross-service utilization of the ATF and ATA. The committee strongly endorses this initiative.

Since the Navy must eventually replace the F-14 as well as the A-6, and the Air Force must eventually replace its F-111's along with its F-15's, the committee believes it is essential that the designs selected for the ATF and ATA anticipate these additional cross-service requirements.

Therefore, the committee has recommended a statutory provision which prohibits the expenditure of funds for the full scale development of either aircraft until the Secretary of Defense has certified that the designs of the aircraft fully accommodate the essential requirements necessary to ensure cross-service utilization.

C-17 AIRLIFTER

The administration requested $612.262 million in RDT&E funds for the C-17 program, as well as $217.3 million in the Aircraft Procurement account.

The committee carefully examined the C-17 program again this year. On balance, the committee concluded that procurement of the C-17 airlifter represents the most cost-effective means to achieve the 66 million ton-miles/day airlift capability necessary to carry out the national military strategy.

While supporting the C-17 program, the committee is concerned that the Air Force may be planning for an unrealistic aircraft production rate. Congress is not likely to fund C-17 production at the planned rate, and the Air Force is cautioned against funding excess production capacity.

The committee recommends authorization of $547.262 million for the C-17 program. This reduction of $65 million from the request can be accommodated within the program without significant delays. The committee recommends no reduction to the request for procurement funding for the C-17, since the first test articles will be transferred to operational use upon completion of RDT&E.

AMRAAM (ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE)

The administration requested $58.1 million, of which $39.1 million was requested for the Air Force and $19.0 million for the Navy, for the research, development, test and evaluation of the Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missile (AMRAAM).

The AMRAAM is a medium range, radar guided, all-aspect air-to-air missile designed to replace the AIM-7 Sparrow in both the Air Force and Navy inventories. The committee strongly endorses this effort to develop an advanced, beyond visual range (BVR) missile with a "launch and leave" capability to ensure the superiority of U.S. and NATO fighters.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request for AMRAAM.

PRECISION LOCATION STRIKE SYSTEM

The administration requested $26.6 million for research, development, test and evaluation of the Precision Location Strike System (PLSS). The administration also requested $80.0 million for PLSS procurement. PLSS is a tactical Air Force system designed to precisely locate enemy air defense emitters.

As a result of substantial cost increases in the PLSS program, the Air Force has decided to terminate the program. The committee supports this decision and recommends that no funds be authorized for the development or procurement of PLSS.

JOINT SURVEILLANCE AND TARGET ACQUISITION RADAR SYSTEM (JSTARS)

The administration requested $355.7 million for the development of the Joint Surveillance and Target Acquisition Radar System (JSTARS). This program is designed to develop an airborne radar system capable of long range acquisition and targeting of ground units. The committee strongly supports the development of this essential capability.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request for the development of JSTARS.

JOINT PROGRAMS FOR CONVENTIONAL DEFENSE

For several years, the committee has strongly supported the development of key joint programs that are, in the committee's judgment, crucial to the nations conventional defense posture. Those joint programs are the Joint Surveillance and Target Acquisition Radar System (JSTARS), the Joint Tactical Cruise Missile (JTACM) program, and the Joint Tactical Fusion program. Together these three programs constitute the core of a fundamentally new strategy for conventional warfare, known as Follow-On Forces Attack (FOFA).

FOFA is a conventional defense strategy designed to attack and disrupt enemy forces deep behind front lines. This strategy combines sophisticated sensors, responsive tactical intelligence systems, and "smart" stand-off weapons to attack armored forces.

The committee assigns the highest priority to these joint programs, and directs that none of the undistributed reductions imposed in the various research and development and procurement accounts be allocated to these three programs.

MAC COMMAND & CONTROL SYSTEM

The administration requested $22.712 million for continued development of the Military Airlift Command (MAC) Command & Control System. This is an increase of $14.9 million above the previous year's budget of $7.741 million.

The committee recommends authorization of $12.712 million for the MAC Command & Control System program. This reduction is made without prejudice, as part of an overall reduction against airlift programs to meet budget limitations.

A-7 STRIKEFIGHTER

Both the Air Force and Air National Guard have expressed strong interest in the evaluation of the A-7 Strikefighter. The A-7 Strikefighter would be a modified version of the existing A-7D and A-7E aircraft. It would consist of upgraded avionics, a new engine, and a stretched fuselage to accommodate the larger engine.

If developed, the A-7 Strikefighter would be procured for the Air National Guard by modifying existing Guard A-7D and Navy A-7E aircraft. It would be procured in lieu of F-16's, at one half the cost of the F-16. The Air Force estimates the total A-7 Strikefighter inventory objective at approximately 350 aircraft.

The committee supports this effort to make maximum use of existing assets. By upgrading the inventory of A-7 aircraft (which have considerable service life remaining) these aircraft will remain operational beyond the year 2010.

The committee recommends an authorization of $35 million for Air Force evaluation of the A-7 Strikefighter. Following the initial evaluation of prototype aircraft, the committee expects this program to be fully competed. Approval to proceed with the overall modification program will be contingent upon the performance of the prototype aircraft and the overall affordability of the program.

REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE AND BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT

The administration requested $250.6 million for Air Force RDT&E for real property maintenance and base operations support for Air Force RDT&E facilities during fiscal year 1987. The committee recommends a $7.9 million reduction to these accounts.

The committee recommends no undistributed reduction be made to these two programs.

SPACE SHUTTLE OPERATIONS

The administration requested $175.9 million in research and development funds for Space Shuttle Operations in fiscal year 1987. These funds provide for the acquisition of upper stages needed to position research and development satellites from low earth orbit to geosynchronous orbits, as well as those funds needed for shuttle flight charges to be reimbursed to NASA. The fiscal year 1987 request continues the funding of Centaur G upper stage vehicles initiated in fiscal year 1985, and acquires two additional Centaurs in support of the MILSTAR program.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense still has credit for approximately ten shuttle flights for which launch charges were prepaid through fiscal year 1986. Since these credits exceed the number of Defense Department flights that NASA currently projects to fly in fiscal years 1987 and 1988, the committee recommends that $32.9 million in research and development funds requested for this purpose not be authorized. The committee further recommends a reduction of $17.1 million in the Space Shuttle Operations account due to budgetary constraints, and the uncertainty in current launch schedules following the recent space launch tragedies. Therefore, $125.9 million is recommended for authorization in fiscal year 1987.

Recommended reductions in the research and development requests for the Space Test Program and the Consolidated Space Operations Center are also due to budgetary constraints and the uncertainties presently surrounding the scheduled recovery of space shuttle operations.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE AGENCIES

(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

					COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION		
			FY 86 FINAL	FY 87 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	RECOMMENDATION	FY 88 PROJECTION
LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT	PROGRAM	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT
1	61101E	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	87,500	95,900		95,900	113,400
2	61101W	IN-HOUSE LAB INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	1,748	2,021		2,021	2,483
3	61103D	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	70,473	0		0	0
4	61103E	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH	5,980	12,500		12,500	24,600
5	62101E	TECHNICAL STUDIES	1,500	0		0	1,700
6	62301E	STRATEGIC TECHNOLOGY	239,370	240,620		240,620	259,500
7	62702E	TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY	94,250	114,000		114,000	117,000
8	62707E	PARTICLE BEAM TECHOLOGY	20,000	15,500		15,500	0
9	62708E	INTEGRATED COMD/CONTROL TECH	49,000	56,500		56,500	64,800
10	62712E	MATERIALS PROCESSING TECH	29,490	34,660		34,660	42,600
11	62714E	NUCLEAR MONITORING	19,500	19,400		13,400	24,400
12	62715H	DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY	350,988	347,013		347,013	408,149
13	62716B	TECHNOLOGY BASE	975	1,930		1,930	2,908
		UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION	---	---	-82,604	-82,604	--
		SUBTOTAL, TECHNOLOGY BASE	970,774	940,044	-82,604	857,440	1,061,540
		STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE:	(2,746,100)	(4,785,155)	(-1,188,155)	(3,597,000)	(5,445,194)
14	63220C	SURVEILLANCE, ACQSN, TRACK & KILL ASSESS	856,956	1,262,413		1,262,413	1,558,279
15	63221C	DIRECTED ENERGY WEAPONS	844,401	1,614,955		1,614,955	1,582,037
16	63222C	KINETIC ENERGY WEAPONS	595,802	991,214		991,214	1,217,226
17	63223C	SYSTEMS CONCEPTS AND BATTLE MANAGEMENT	227,339	462,206		462,206	563,998
18	63224C	SURVIVABILITY, LETHALITY & KEY SPT TECH	221,602	454,367		454,367	523,654
		UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION	---	---	-1,188,155	-1,188,155	--
19	63225D	JOIN DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECH DEV	7,787	8,803		8,803	9,042
20	63226E	EXP EVAL OF MAJOR INNOVATIVE TECH	177,179	172,600		172,600	168,753
21	63269E	NATIONAL AERO SPACE PLANE TECHNOLOGY PRO	0	60,000		60,000	80,000
22	63702D	SPECIAL OPERATIONS SPECIAL TECHNOLOGY OF	3,925	4,365		4,365	4,464
23	63703D	COUNTER INSURGENCY & SPECIAL TECHNOLOGY	10,732	12,180		12,180	11,539

			FY 86 FINAL	FY 87 REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION
LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT	PROGRAM	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT	AMOUNT
24	63706D	MICROWAVE/MILLIMETER WAVE MONOLITHIC INT	0	11,172		11,172	36,183
25	63736D	COMPUTER AIDED LOGISTICS SUPPORT	0	14,831		14,831	14,749
26	63756D	DOD SOFTWARE INITIATIVES (STARS)	0	35,220		35,220	36,532
27	35108K	COMMAND AND CONTROL RESEARCH	1,813	2,062		2,062	2,227
		UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION	---	---	-29,351	-29,351	--
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED TECH DEVELOPMENT	2,947,536	5,106,388	-1,217,506	3,888,882	5,808,683
28	63734K	ISLAND SUN	14,131	31,853		31,853	53,095
29	32016K	NMCS-WIDE SUPPORT	36,872	10,485		10,485	11,897
30	32017K	WWMCCS ADP-JTSA	0	0		0	0
31	32019K	WWMCCS SYSTEM ENGINEER	21,033	19,279		19,279	16,149
32	33131K	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMER COMM NETWORK	11,816	11,301		11,301	10,542
		SUBTOTAL, STRATEGIC PROGRAMS	83,852	72,918	0	72,918	91,683
33	64770D	JT SURVIVABILITY & TARGET ATTACK RADAR S	188,138	0		0	0
34	64771D	COMMON JT TACTICAL INFO DISTRIBUTION SYS	187,931	211,930		211,930	221,690
35	64772D	JOINT ADVANCED SYSTEMS	281,896	0		0	0
36	21135K	CINC C2 INITIATIVES	2,083	2,158		2,158	2,219
37	28045Q	C3 INTEROPERABILITY (JOINT TACTICAL C3 A	57,271	68,835		68,835	63,473
38	28298Q	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (JTC3A)	1,858	8,816		8,816	8,223
		SUBTOTAL, TACTICAL PROGRAMS	719,177	291,739	0	291,739	295,605
39	63701B	MAP/CHART/GEODESY INV/PROTOTYPE DEV	13,197	15,584		15,584	14,759
40	64701B	MAP/CHART/GEODESY ENGR DEV/TEST	3,092	2,337		2,337	3,855
41	31011G	CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
42	31301L	GENERAL DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
43	33126K	LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS (DCS)	16,256	39,113		39,113	38,839
44	33127K	SUPPORT OF THE NCS	2,803	3,041		3,041	2,447
45	33401G	COMMUNICATIONS SECURITY	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
46	35139B	DMA EXPLOITATION PROGRAM	233,771	243,629		243,629	[ ]

LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL	FY 87 REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION		FY 88 PROJECTION
					CHANGE FROM REQUEST	RECOMMENDATION	
			AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT
47	35159B	DEF RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	7,250	10,129		10,129	[ ]
48	35159G	DEF RECONNAISSANCE ACTIVITIES	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
49	35159I	DEFENSE RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT ACTIVITIE	252,607	147,055		147,055	[ ]
50	35167G	COMPUTER SECURITY	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
51	35884L	INTEL PLAN AND REVIEW ACTIVITIES	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
52	35885G	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
		CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,252,379	1,275,813		1,275,813	1,730,974
		UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION	---	---	-42,177	-42,177	--
		SUBTOTAL, INTELLIGENCE & COMMUNICATIONS	1,781,355	1,736,701	-42,177	1,694,524	1,790,874
53	63790D	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	23,491	49,436		49,436	0
54	65104D	TECHNICAL SUPPORT TO USDR/E	18,317	20,617		20,617	23,407
55	65106D	GENERAL SUPPORT FOR PA/E	2,339	3,912		3,912	5,427
56	65107D	SUPPORT TO POLICY	6,192	6,931		6,931	10,815
57	65108D	GENERAL SUPPORT FOR NET ASSESSMENT	3,789	4,415		4,415	5,563
58	65109D	GENERAL SUPPORT FOR FM&P	1,691	2,049		2,049	3,030
59	65110D	CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY	2,623	3,474		3,474	4,010
60	65112D	RAND RESEARCH CENTER FOR OSD & OJCS	14,096	16,717		16,717	17,324
61	65112E	TECHNICAL ANALYTICAL SUPPORT	0	0		0	0
62	65113D	TAPESTRY	0	2,801		2,801	3,191
63	65114E	BLACKLITE	4,000	4,000		4,000	4,000
64	65115J	CINC CONTRACT STUDIES SUPPORT	0	5,000		5,000	5,406
65	65116D	GENERAL SUPPORT TO C3I	2,161	3,164		3,164	2,821
66	65117D	FOREIGN MATERIALS ACQUISTION & EXPLOITAT	0	14,831		14,831	14,594
67	65119D	GENERAL SUPPORT FOR A&L	2,349	3,263		3,263	3,407
68	65502E	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH	0	0		0	0
69	65711S	CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS	0	3,000		3,000	3,800
70	65801S	DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFO CENTER	20,328	22,500		22,500	28,921
71	65802S	INFORMATION ANALYSIS CENTERS	6,500	7,550		7,550	8,550
72	65898C	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS SDI	13,122	17,411		17,411	18,118
73	65898E	MGT HQ (RESEARCH/DEVELOPMENT)	12,148	12,200		12,200	13,300

BLANK PAGE

BLANK PAGE

BLANK PAGE

LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT	PROGRAM	FY 86 FINAL AMOUNT	FY 87 REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT	FY 88 PROJECTION AMOUNT
74	78011S	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	5,000	11,500		11,500	15,100
75	01015D	TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER FUNCTIONS	1,546	1,739		1,739	1,745
		UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION	---	---	-9,389	-9,389	--
		SUBTOTAL, DEFENSEWIDE MISSION SUPPORT	139,692	216,510	-9,389	207,121	192,529
	------	CONVENTIONAL DEFENSE INITIATIVE	---	---	453,000	453,000	---
		CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	---	[ ]	-3,650	-3,650	---
		UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION	---	---	-108,000	-108,000	--
		SUBTOTAL, DEFENSE AGENCIES RDT&E	6,642,386	8,364,300	-1,010,326	7,353,974	9,240,914
		DIRECTOR OF TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE	0	0		0	0
1	63790D	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	25,000	47,991		47,991	0
2	65111D	FOREIGN WEAPONS EVALUATION	17,010	18,010		18,010	18,010
3	65804D	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION DEFENSE	76,490	75,799		75,799	79,868
		SUBTOTAL, DIRECTOR OF TEST & EVALUATION	118,500	141,800	0	141,800	97,878
		DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONAL TEST + EVALUATION					
1	65118D	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION DEFENSE	0	11,300		11,300	11,735
		SUBTOTAL, DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION	0	11,300	0	11,300	11,735
		TOTAL, DEFENSE AGENCIES RDT&E	6,760,386	8,517,400	-1,010,326	7,507,074	9,350,527

STRATEGIC TECHNOLOGY

The Committee notes the progress achieved in the Sandia Winged Energetic Reentry Vehicle Experiment (SWERVE) program being conducted under the auspices of the Defense Advance Research Projects Agency. SWERVE combines an advanced reentry vehicle design with a phased array radar and a sophisticated, miniaturized guidance computer. The Committee encourages DARPA, consistent with budgetary constraints, to continue to pursue this systems approach, mating these elements in its Long Range Intercept Experiment (LORAIN) program.

SDI AND A BALANCED TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVE

The administration requested $4.78 billion for the President's Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) program in fiscal year 1987. The SDI program is intended to determine the feasibility of comprehensive strategic defenses against ballistic missiles that are survivable and cost effective at the margin. The program is also tasked with developing defensive deployment options as a possible response should the Soviet Union break out of the ABM Treaty.

The administration requested a significant funding increase for SDI in fiscal year 1987, reflecting the high priority it attaches to this program. Compared to last year's SDI appropriation of $3.018 billion, this year's request for $5.319 billion represents a 73% real increase. The funding request in the five major DOD program elements is as follows:

STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE FUNDING
(DOLLARS IN MILLIONS)

Surveillance, Acquisition, Tracking and Kill Assessment	1,262.4
Directed Energy Weapons	1,614.9
Kinetic Energy Weapons	991.2
Systems Concepts and Battle Management	462.2
Survivability, Lethality, and Key Support Technologies	454.4
TOTAL	4,785.1

The administration also requested $534 million for SDI in Department of Energy (DOE) accounts.

The committee continues to support a robust SDI research program because it believes the program serves a number of valid U.S. national security purposes. However, it believes that SDI should be but one part—albeit an important part—of a broad-based and balanced U.S. technology initiative that addresses the entire range of nuclear and conventional deficiencies in our defense posture.

The committee is concerned that the current and projected funding levels for SDI, as reflected in the administration's fiscal year 1987 request and the Five Year Defense Plan, threaten to absorb an inordinate proportion of defense dollars allocated to research and development. The committee also believes that the administration's fiscal year 87-91 funding profile for the SDI is excessive in light of the absence of basic architectures for this program and continuing indications of basic disagreements within the administration as to the program's goals.

Accordingly, the committee decided to provide a 28% real increase in SDI funding for fiscal year 1987 in lieu of the 73% real growth requested by the administration. The committee authorizes $3.597 billion for SDI in DOD accounts and $356 million in DOE accounts, for a total of $3.953 billion. In making this decision, the committee endorsed a concept for a balanced technology initiative and directed that $453 million in funds requested for SDI and $34 million from DOE accounts be applied to, but not limited to, specified conventional defense enhancement purposes consistent with this concept. No portion of these funds may be applied to any project or activity in support of the SDI.

It is the intention of the committee to sustain its support for a balanced technology initiative in the years ahead. As part of this broad technological thrust, the committee intends to support SDI at a robust but measured level consistent with the ABM Treaty until such time as progress in defining appropriate and realistic architectures, and determining the technical feasibility, survivability and cost effectiveness at the margin of potential SDI systems warrants further growth in funding.

Refocusing the SDI

The committee believes that SDI should be structured to promote a number of realistic goals consistent with our national security interests. First, SDI continues to represent an important response to the threat to U.S. national security posed by the Soviet Union's activities in the areas of strategic defense research, development, and deployment. Since the signing of the ABM Treaty in 1972, the Soviet Union has continued to spend as much on its strategic defense forces—including air and civil defense—as it has on its strategic offensive forces. This indicates that since the signing of the ABM Treaty, the Soviet Union has continued to maintain the high priority that it has historically attached to strategic defense of its homeland. SDI research is necessary in order to understand better the nature and pace of Soviet research on strategic defenses, especially research on "exotic" technologies.

Second, the committee continues to believe that a portion of the SDI research program should emphasize options for near-term deployment as a hedge against the possibility of a Soviet ABM "breakout" in the near-term. The committee continues to believe that the SDI Organization (SDIO) is paying inadequate attention to such issues.

Third, the administration has continued to place primary emphasis within the SDI program on comprehensive strategic defenses that would be highly effective in the face of a determined adversary utilizing responsive countermeasures. Defenses of this type would be very complex, and the ability of defensive technologies to support these goals is as yet uncertain. Issues such as effective midcourse discrimination and the ability of computer software to perform the necessary battle management functions remain to be resolved.

Accordingly, while the committee believes that the potential ability of ballistic missile defenses to provide comprehensive, nationwide population protection should continue to be explored, the major emphasis within the SDI should be dedicated to developing survivable and cost effective defensive options for enhancing the survivability of U.S. retaliatory forces and command, control and communications systems.

Fourth, the committee also supports a robust SDI research program for the leverage it provides to our negotiators in Geneva. The committee, however, believes that it is not necessary to fund the President's entire request for SDI to maintain our negotiating leverage in Geneva. It is the committee's belief that leverage for arms control negotiations comes only from real defense programs which are aimed at realistic objectives, adequately funded, and broadly supported by a bipartisan consensus. The committee believes our negotiators in Geneva are well-served by a robust and well-managed SDI research program.

In this regard, the committee would note that negotiating leverage is sometimes a perishable commodity. If we are to capitalize on the historic opportunities in arms control created in part by SDI, we should be prepared to consider adjustments to the pace and scope of SDI if the Soviet Union agrees to significant, stabilizing and verifiable reductions in strategic offensive forces.

The Question Of Priorities

The committee is charged with broad policy and oversight responsibilities, including the addressing of priorities. The committee notes that if SDI research were successful in rendering nuclear weapons "impotent and obsolete," the United States would still require a second research and development effort to negate bomber-delivered and cruise-missile-carried weapons. In the committee's judgment, the advent of low observables technology may well make this effort quite as challenging as the President's vision of SDI.

And if technology succeeds in eliminating the threat of both missile and bomber delivered nuclear weapons, unfortunately, the world's citizens may still not be freed from the threat of mass destruction, whether from clandestinely delivered nuclear weapons or from other forms of warfare. Moreover, our European allies would surely have reason to pause at the prospect of the elimination of nuclear weapons, in light of the enormous disparity in conventional weapons between NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

Therefore, NATO needs to rigorously pursue its technological capabilities in dealing with the threat of tank armies as well as the threat of ballistic missiles. NATO must find ways in which its collective technological capabilities can be made to counter the masses of Soviet weapons systems that we are not prepared to match but which we must deter.

Exploiting Technology At The Conventional Level

Research and development on basic new technology and on technology for conventional warfare has suffered greatly in recent years: in 1981 over 16% of RDT&E funds were invested in the defense technology base, but in the fiscal year 1987 budget request, only 8.7% was allocated to the technology base. In real terms, the technology base funding has declined every year since fiscal year 1983. The sharpest decrease coincides precisely with the buildup of the SDI program. Indeed, the funding level proposed for SDI next year will be larger than the entire research and development budget for the Department of the Army.

The committee has decided to expand the role of technology and innovative weapons concepts while reducing the growth rate of the SDI research program. This involves measures to strengthen both the defense technology base and research on advanced conventional warfare technologies, with the goal of "leapfrogging" current quantitative imbalances and the narrowing qualitative advantages of current fielded equipment. Therefore, the committee is redirecting a portion of SDI funding to meet these other high-priority objectives, and has provided appropriate bill language in both the DOD and DOE portions of the bill.

The committee intends to encourage balanced technology development efforts across-the-board, in areas such as armor/anti-armor initiatives; defenses against armed helicopters; hypervelocity missiles for ground combat use; defense against anti-ship missiles including those with "stealth" characteristics; "smart" mines for both land and ocean warfare; lightweight, air transportable vehicles with anti-armor capabilities for rapid transport to remote areas; improved conventional anti-submarine warfare munitions; and "smart" standoff munitions and submunitions for aircraft delivery outside of lethal air defense ranges.

The committee recognizes that technology alone cannot constitute a solution to conventional force imbalances. Continued investment in major end items of equipment is also an important contribution to redressing force imbalances. The committee has, in many cases, acted to preserve production rates of major end-items from reductions taken in lower-priority accounts. But the committee is convinced that, unless our technology development efforts for conventional forces are enhanced, a serious imbalance between NATO and the Warsaw Pact will continue for the foreseeable future. The solution to this requires greater balance in our defense technology efforts.

Programmatic Recommendations

Funding for the Strategic Defense Initiative is authorized at $3.597 billion for DOD funds and at $356 million for DOE funds. The Director of the SDIO shall have the latitude to apportion the available DOD funds, but should bear in mind the committee's concerns expressed above.

A fund for enhancing technology research in selected areas of importance to conventional defenses is established. Fiscal year 1987 funding is authorized at not less than $300 million, and the Director of Defense Research and Engineering shall be responsible for the apportioning of the funds to the military services and defense agencies, in accordance with the priorities expressed herein and in the bill language. In addition to these funds, not less than $153 million is authorized for enhancing the defense technology base; the Director of Defense Research and Engineering shall be responsible for apportioning these funds among the services and defense agencies.

The Director of Defense Research and Engineering will have a critical role to play in the establishment of this program, both in apportioning funds authorized in this bill and in identifying ongoing research efforts that should be augmented, consolidated, or otherwise included in a broad-based conventional defense technology development effort aimed at "leapfrogging" current deficiencies. Therefore, the committee expects to receive a detailed report on the programs he selects, their prior and enhanced funding levels, their prior and enhanced funding profiles for the current FYDP, and a set of major milestones and dates against which the Congress will be able to measure progress under this initiative.

Other SDI-Related Issues

Anti-Tactical Ballistic Missile Defenses: Last year, the committee expressed its concern about the serious threat to high value NATO targets posed by Soviet short—and intermediate-range ballistic missiles armed with conventional, chemical and nuclear warheads. The committee felt that this was an area in which defensive systems could make a positive contribution to U.S. and allied security in the near term. However, the committee felt that insufficient emphasis was being given to this area within the SDI program. The SDI Organization was encouraged to coordinate with Department of Defense activities on anti-tactical ballistic missile (ATBM) development options, and consult closely with our allies on these activities.

Since that time, there has been a growing recognition both in the United States and abroad of the serious implications of these Soviet tactical ballistic missile systems for our security and that of our allies. As indicated by recent public statements like that of West German Defense Minister Manfred Woerner, the development of a defense against Soviet tactical ballistic missiles is an essential element in NATO efforts to improve its conventional defense posture. NATO spokesmen have spoken in terms of an "expanded air defense", which would utilize upgrades of existing air defense systems to meet the tactical ballistic missile threat in the short term. Such an approach is consistent with the evolutionary approach to theater defense that the committee supports.

U.S. allies in regions other than NATO Europe also face tactical ballistic missile threats, and thus have strong interests in the development of anti-tactical ballistic missile defenses. Syrian SS-21 tactical ballistic missiles pose a very serious threat to the security of Israel, and Soviet tactical ballistic missiles pose a threat to our allies in Asia. These nations should be encouraged to participate in the development of anti-tactical ballistic missile defenses as well.

The committee conducted two hearings on this subject during its consideration of the fiscal year 1987 defense budget request. The first hearing focused on the Soviet tactical ballistic missile threat, the role of tactical ballistic missiles in Soviet military doctrine, and the vulnerability of key NATO targets to this threat. The second hearing focused on the activities within the Department of Defense to address this threat. These hearings confirmed the seriousness of the Soviet tactical ballistic missile threat, as well as the committee's view that the job of addressing this threat is receiving insufficient attention within the Department of Defense.

Recommendation: To facilitate and support the development and deployment of an anti-tactical ballistic missile defense system, the committee has identified up to $50.0 million within the SDI program for the purpose of accelerating research and development activities associated with an ATBM system. The committee has included bill language identifying funds for this purpose. None of these funds should be used in a manner inconsistent with the 1972 ABM Treaty. The funding added by the committee should be used to accelerate the development of relevant technologies to support the full scale engineering development of a system in fiscal year 1988, with a view towards deployment in the early 1990's.

It is the committee's view that the development of an ATBM system should be a cooperative development program involving our allies, and that U.S. activities should be designed to support such a cooperative development. The committee is aware that system architecture efforts are being undertaken in fiscal year 1986 to define the threat and identify the system requirements for a theater defense system. In the committee's view, the development of a theater defense system should be undertaken on a matching fund basis with substantial contributions from allies involved in the program. Before more than 25% of these funds are expended, a Memorandum of Understanding or other formal agreement outlining the contributions of various parties and the milestones for this development program should be executed.

Prior to the initiation of full scale engineering development, the Secretary of Defense is required to provide the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report outlining the estimated costs and schedule associated with meeting these objectives. This report should also address the status of efforts to integrate all elements of a theater defense, including both active and passive measures.

SDI Countermeasures: The committee requests that future versions of the administration's Report to the Congress on the Strategic Defense Initiative contain a section on Countermeasures similar to Appendix A of the 1986 Report. The committee would like to commend the SDI Organization for establishing a countermeasures office, and urges that it be operated in a manner that provides independent and objective analysis of all potential countermeasures to a strategic defense system.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

The administration requested $85,773.0 million for the operation and maintenance of the armed forces and the component agencies of the Department of Defense in fiscal year 1987.

The committee recommends authorization of $81,218.9 million for operation and maintenance in fiscal year 1987, a reduction of $4,554.1 million from the request. The committee estimates that the recommended level of authorization will provide for zero percent real funding growth over the amounts appropriated in fiscal year 1986.

PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1986 BUDGET AUTHORITY	FISCAL YEAR 1987 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	RECOMMENDATION
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE				
ARMY	19,097,557	21,341,870	-677,800	20,664,070
NAVY	24,514,719	25,688,500	-1,412,540	24,275,960
MARINE CORPS	1,612,050	1,864,100	-30,000	1,834,100
AIR FORCE	19,620,538	21,214,500	-1,796,129	19,418,371
DEFENSE AGENCIES	7,600,894	8,573,700	-240,772	8,332,928
ARMY RESERVE	780,100	793,100	-14,800	778,300
NAVY RESERVE	894,950	975,900	-69,900	906,000
MARINE CORPS RESERVE	57,200	65,300	-2,300	63,000
AIR FORCE RESERVE	902,700	975,600	-70,800	904,800
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD	1,652,800	1,786,900	-64,100	1,722,800
AIR NATIONAL GUARD	1,806,200	1,932,700	-158,000	1,774,700
RIFLE PRACTICE	920	930	0	930
CLAIMS, DEFENSE	143,300	155,600	-11,500	144,100
COURT OF MIL APPEALS	3,200	3,400	-200	3,200
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FUND, DEFENSE	(379,100)	385,900	-15,300	370,600
PAN AMERICAN GAMES	10,000	15,000	0	15,000
AFGHANISTAN AID	10,000	0	10,000	10,000
TOTAL:	78,697,128	85,773,000	-4,554,141	81,218,859

SUMMARY

The committee recommendation on funding for operation and maintenance is based on providing the required funding to maintain and in some cases improve the current military capability of the United States Armed Forces.

During the past few years, a number of readiness trends have improved, but these trends appear to have leveled off and some have even reversed as a result of congressionally mandated budget reductions. The committee seeks further improvements in all readiness measures.

The committee recommended reductions to the fiscal year 1987 request have been made using the following themes:

o Fund modernization projects.

o Increase O&M to support and maintain added force structure.

o Complete unfinished development and procurement items remaining when the systems become operational.

o Fund additional flying time, steaming days, battalion training days, exercises, and training. Training a larger force structure at the same levels requires greater funding.

o Increase funding and make program funding transfers on requested ammunition investments.

o Attempt to maintain achievements in increased readiness and sustainability with the funding levels recommended.

o Minimize micromanagement in recommended reductions.

The Department of Defense should utilize the authorized funds for programs with the highest priority.

The committee recommends adjustments to the operation and maintenance accounts in anticipation of more favorable prices than budgeted for purchases of fuel, supplies, and material by the Stock Funds. The inflation estimate for fiscal year 1987 was thought to be too high also.

These expected lower costs will allow the Stock Funds to make refunds (pass-through) to the O&M customers to offset the reductions recommended here. While these revised projections are consistent with recent experience and current trends, there is no certainty that they will actually materialize. In the event that savings of the magnitude projected are not realized by the Stock Funds, sufficient cash balances should exist to make the necessary refunds. The committee expects the Department of Defense to accommodate these reductions through whatever combination of refunds, drawdown of stock fund cash balances, or program reductions will be least disruptive to program accomplishment. The committee expects program reductions by the services will be made only as a last resort.

FINANCING ADJUSTMENTS

Adjustments were made for the potential changes in prices for fuel, inflation, and stock fund items.

PERSONNEL

Reductions in the operation and maintenance accounts were recommended to reflect the effect of the requested but disallowed increases in civilian and military manpower end strengths for fiscal year 1987 and additional funding reductions for civilian personnel.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

The administration requested approximately $21,341.9 million for operation and maintenance of the Army in fiscal year 1987. The request provided for 11.8 percent growth over the fiscal year 1986 program. Growth in the request focused on continuing support for modernization, depot maintenance, force structure changes, base operation support and increased flying hours.

The committee recommends $20,664.1 million for O&M, Army, a reduction of $677.8 million from the administration request. The committee recommendation will provide for approximately 8.2 percent growth over the fiscal year 1986 program.

The overall effect of the committee recommendation is to continue support for training and modernization, and provide full program funding to all readiness program items.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

The administration requested $25,688.5 million for operation and maintenance of the Navy in fiscal year 1987. The request provided for approximately 4.8 percent growth over the fiscal year 1986 program. The request reflected increases in ship and aircraft inventories, flying hours, and the modernization programs.

The committee recommends $24,276.0 million for Navy O&M, a reduction of $1,412.5 million from the administration request. The committee recommendation will provide for approximately 1.0 percent reduction over the fiscal year 1986 program.

The effect of the committee recommendation is to continue full support for ship operations and flying hours. The budget request and committee recommendation will increase the number of maintenance, repair, and overhaul backlogs and will reduce growth in logistics and support programs.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

The administration requested $1,864.1 million for operation and maintenance of the Marine Corps in fiscal year 1987. The request provided for approximately 15.6 percent growth over the fiscal year 1986 program.

The committee recommends $1,834.1 million for O&M, Marine Corps in fiscal year 1987, a reduction of $30.0 million from the administration's request.

The overall effect of the committee recommendation is to continue support for training and modernization and provide full program funding to all readiness program items.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

The administration requested $21,214.5 million for operation and maintenance of the Air Force in fiscal year 1987. The request provided for 8.1 percent growth over the fiscal year 1986 program. Growth in the request focused on continuing support for modernization, depot maintenance, force structure changes, base operation support, and increased flying hours.

The committee recommends $19,418.4 million in O&M, Air Force, a reduction of $1,796.1 million from the administration's request. The committee recommendation will provide for approximately 1.0 percent reduction over the fiscal year 1986 program.

The overall effect of the committee recommendation is to continue support for training and modernization, and provide full funding to all readiness programs.

Space Shuttle Support Flight Charges for DOD Shuttle Mission

In the fiscal year 1987 budget, the administration requested $268.8 million in Air Force O&M, $32.9 million in Air Force RDT&E and $297.9 million in Air Force Missile Procurement to reimburse NASA for fiscal year 1988 DOD Shuttle missions. The committee is aware that the Air Force has credit for approximately

10 shuttle flights (paid for in fiscal years 1983-1986 for flights through fiscal year 1987). Since the DOD credits paid for in fiscal years 1983-1986 exceed the number of DOD flights that NASA currently projects to fly in fiscal year 1987 and fiscal year 1988, the committee recommends that the fiscal year 1987 flight charges be limited to $43.3 million in Air Force Missile Procurement. The $43.3 million will allow the full funding of one mission (including optional services) that has moved from the Phase I to the Phase II pricing period. Credit for flights previously paid for will be applied to any DOD missions flown in fiscal year 1987 and beyond until exhausted.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE AGENCIES

The administration requested approximately $8,573.7 million for operation and maintenance of the Defense Agencies in fiscal year 1987. The request provided for 12.8 percent growth over the fiscal year 1986 program.

The committee recommends $8,332.9 million O&M, Defense Agencies, a decrease of $240.8 million from the administration's request. The committee recommendation will provide for approximately 9.6 percent growth over the fiscal year 1986 program.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE

The administration requested approximately $793.1 million for operation and maintenance of the Army Reserve in fiscal year 1987. The request provided for 1.7 percent growth over the fiscal year 1986 program.

The committee recommends $778.3 million in O&M, Army Reserve, a reduction of $14.8 million from the administration's request. The committee recommendation will provide for approximately .2 percent reduction from the fiscal year 1986 program.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE

The administration requested approximately $975.9 million for operation and maintenance of the Navy Reserve in fiscal year 1987. The request provided for 9.0 percent growth over the fiscal year 1986 program.

The committee recommends $906.0 million in O&M, Navy Reserve a reduction of $69.9 million from the administration's request. The committee recommendation will provide for approximately 1.2 percent growth over the fiscal year 1986 program.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

The administration requested approximately $65.3 million for operation and maintenance of the Marine Corps Reserve in fiscal year 1987. The request provided for 14.2 percent growth over the fiscal year 1986 program.

The committee recommends $63.0 million in O&M, Marine Corps Reserve, a reduction of $2.3 million from the administration's request. The committee recommendation will provide for approximately 10.1 percent growth over the fiscal year 1986 program.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE

The administration requested approximately $975.6 million for operation and maintenance of the Air Force Reserve in fiscal year 1987. The request provided for 8.1 percent growth over the fiscal year 1986 program.

The committee recommends $904.8 million in O&M, Air Force Reserve, a reduction of $70.8 million from the administration's request. The committee recommendation will provide for approximately .2 percent growth over the fiscal year 1986 program.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

The administration requested approximately $1,786.9 million for operation and maintenance of the Army National Guard in fiscal year 1987. The request provided for 7.5 percent growth over the fiscal year 1986 program.

The committee recommends $1,722.8 million in O&M, Army National Guard, a reduction of $64.1 million from the administration's request. The committee recommendation will provide for approximately 4.2 percent growth over the fiscal year 1986 program.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

The administration requested approximately $1,932.7 million for operation and maintenance of the Air National Guard in fiscal year 1987. The request provide for 7.0 percent growth over the fiscal year 1986 program.

The committee recommends $1,774.7 million in O&M, Air National Guard, a reduction of $158.0 million from the administration's request. The committee recommendation will provide for approximately 1.7 percent reduction from the fiscal year 1986 year level.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NATIONAL BOARD FOR THE PROMOTION OF RIFLE PRACTICE

The administration requested approximately $.9 million for operation and maintenance of the The National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice for the fiscal year 1987 program.

The committee recommends $.9 million in O&M, National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice with no reduction from the administration's request. The committee recommendation will provide for approximately 1.1 percent increase over the fiscal year 1986 program.

CLAIMS, DEFENSE

The administration requested approximately $155.6 million for the Claims, Defense account in fiscal year 1987. The request provided for 8.6 percent growth over fiscal year 1986 program.

The committee recommends $144.1 million for the Claims, Defense account, a reduction of $11.5 million from the administration's request. The committee recommendation will provide for approximately .6 percent growth over the fiscal year 1986 program.

COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS, DEFENSE

The administration requested approximately $3.4 million for the Court of Military Appeals, Defense in fiscal year 1987. The request provided for 6.3 percent growth over the fiscal year 1986 program.

The committee recommends $3.2 million for Court of Military Appeals, Defense, a reduction of $.2 million from the administration's request. The committee recommendation will provide for no growth over the fiscal year 1986 program.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FUND, DEFENSE

The administration requested $385.9 million for operation of the fund for fiscal year 1987. The request provided for approximately 1.8 percent growth over the increased amount provided for fiscal year 1986.

The committee recommends $370.6 million for the fund in fiscal year 1987. This is a reduction of $15.3 million from the administration's request. The committee recommendation will provide for approximately 2.2 percent reduction over the fiscal year 1986 program.

The committee believes the reduced level is adequate based on the lateness of resolving the fiscal year 1986 additional funding and the unused balances of previous year's funding. The unused balances are often due to the timing resolution of contractual and legal negotiations surrounding restoration projects, not poor management on the part of the Department of Defense.

PAN AMERICAN GAMES, 1987

The administration requested $15.0 million for support of the Pan American Games, 1987. The funds remaining from the fiscal year 1986 funding can be carried forward until the games are over.

In 1987 Indianapolis will host the Tenth Pan American Games. These games will be, in effect, the hemisphere's preparation for the 1988 Olympic Games. The Pan American Games, as such, have the full support of the State Department and the White House.

The City of Indianapolis, however, anticipates a shortfall in its ability to meet all security (including anti-terrorist), communication, logistical, and other requirements necessary to stage the Games. There are precedents for Defense Department and Federal assistance—most recently the 1984 Los Angeles Summer Olympics, the 1980 Lake Placid Winter Olympics, and the 1979 San Juan Pan American Games.

The authorization of $15.0 million in fiscal year 1987 will allow for preparations for the Games to proceed. This total will provide for security, communications, transportation, aviation support, logistical support, and the use of DOD and National Guard personnel and equipment.

The committee recommends the Secretary of Defense be authorized:

(1) to provide logistical support and personnel services to the Tenth International Pan American Games;

(2) to lend and provide equipment in support of the Tenth International Pan American Games; and

(3) to provide such other services and facilities in support of the Tenth International Pan American Games as the Secretary may consider advisable.

Except for funds used for pay and non-travel related allowances for civilian DOD personnel and for members of the Armed Forces (other than members of the reserve components called or ordered to active duty to provide support for the Tenth International Pan American Games), no funds should be obligated for these functions unless specifically appropriated for these functions. The costs for pay and non-travel related allowances for civilian DOD personnel and for members of the Armed Forces (other than members of the reserve forces called or ordered to active duty to provide support for the Pan American Games) should not be charged to appropriations made pursuant to this authorization.

The committee recommends this authorization in view of the serious security concerns associated with major international competitions. The committee commends the Department of Defense for following the policy adopted in the fiscal year 1986 DOD Authorization Act. The policy provided that the request for such assistance and funding support must be approved by the administration and included as part of the Department of Defense budget request, with explicit reimbursement to the Department of Defense for costs incurred.

AFGHANISTAN AID

The recommendation to provide $10.0 million to transport humanitarian relief supplies to Afghan refugees will continue the program begun in the fiscal year 1986 Department of Defense Authorization Act.

The committee recommends the Secretary of Defense be authorized to transfer to the Secretary of State or his designated representative, funds not to exceed five percent of the total appropriation authorized by this section to provide local transportation, including the purchase, lease or rent of transportation assets.

The committee fully intends for this and prior year funding for transportation to be used for expenses normally associated with administration for transportation of humanitarian cargo and medical patients. Funding for these expenses shall not exceed two percent of this total authorization.

This change is needed to correct two problems which have arisen during the first year of operation.

The first deals with transportation of government administrators, partial trip packaging and/or repackaging of supplies, and additional inflight and enroute expenses required by medical patients. The limit of two percent is placed on this category to discourage misuse by or transfer to other U.S. agencies for items normally included in their budget requests.

The second problem, covered in the bill language, deals with providing local transportation expenses outside the United States. The distribution of humanitarian relief supplies to Afghan refugees from the airport where the supplies are delivered to the individual refugee camps and the removal of medical patients are both covered by this provision. The limit of five percent is placed on this category to discourage misuse of funds or transfer to other U.S. agencies for items normally included in their budget request.

PROGRAM	FY 86 REQUEST AMOUNT	FY 86 FINAL AMOUNT	FY 87 REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY:	20,190,630	19,097,557	21,341,870		
Base Operation Support (BOS)				-43,000	
C 3				-8,000	
Supply Operations				-28,000	
Recruiting, Advent. & Exam.				-1,000	
Medical				-2,000	
Administration				-2,000	
Other				-7,000	
Studies Programs				-25,000	
Stockfund, Nonfuel Repricing				-59,800	
Industrial Fund Repricing				-100,000	
Stockfund, Fuel Repricing				-176,600	
Civilian Personnel, FY87 Increase				-91,000	
Military Personnel, FY87 Increase				-200	
Inflation Adjustment				-135,100	
Other				900	
TOTAL CHANGE:				-677,800	
ARMY SUBTOTAL:					20,664,070

PROGRAM	FY 86 REQUEST	FY 86 FINAL	FY 87 REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
				CHANGE FROM REQUEST	RECOMMENDATION
	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY:	25,797,700	24,514,719	25,688,500		
Base Operations Support (BOS)				-45,000	
C 3				-15,000	
Supply Operations				-12,000	
Other Logistics				-13,000	
Recruiting, Advent. & Exam.				-2,000	
Medical				-2,000	
Administration				-6,000	
Other				-30,000	
Stockfund, nonfuel Repricing				-71,200	
Industrial Fund Repricing				-100,000	
Stockfund, Fuel Repricing				-748,400	
Civilian Personnel, FY 1987 Increase				-126,100	
Military Personnel, FY 1987 Increase				-8,000	
Inflation Adjustment				-230,600	
Other				-3,240	
TOTAL CHANGE:				-1,412,540	
NAVY SUBTOTAL:					24,275,960

	FY 86 REQUEST	FY 86 FINAL	FY 87 REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
				CHANGE FROM REQUEST	RECOMMENDATION
PROGRAM	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS:	1,667,400	1,612,050	1,864,100		
Stockfund, Nonfuel Repricing				-4,800	
Stockfund, Fuel Pricing				-11,000	
Military Personnel, FY 1987 Increase				-1,000	
Inflation Adjustment				-13,200	
TOTAL CHANGE:				-30,000	
MARINE CORPS SUBTOTAL:					1,834,100

PROGRAM	FY 86 REQUEST AMOUNT	FY 86 FINAL AMOUNT	FY 87 REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE:	20,924,400	19,620,538	21,214,500		
Base Operation Support (BOS)				-31,000	
C 3				-27,000	
Medical				-2,000	
Administration				-2,000	
Other				-60,000	
Stockfund, Nonfuel Repricing				-39,000	
Industrial Fund Repricing				-100,000	
Stockfund, Fuel Repricing				-1,103,600	
Civilian Personnel, FY 1987 Increase				-1,600	
Military Personnel, FY 1987 Increase				-1,300	
Inflation Adjustment				-153,700	
Other				-6,129	
Shuttle Launches				-268,800	
TOTAL CHANGE:				-1,796,129	
AIR FORCE SUBTOTAL:					19,418,371

PROGRAM	FY 86 REQUEST AMOUNT	FY 86 FINAL AMOUNT	FY 87 REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE AGENCIES:	7,568,900	7,600,894	8,573,700		
C 3				-21,000	
Medical				-5,000	
Administration				-21,000	
Other				0	
Stockfund, Nonfuel Repricing				-2,200	
Civilian Personnel, FY 1987 Increase				-166,200	
Inflation Adjustment				-47,300	
Other				21,928	
TOTAL CHANGE:				-240,772	
DEFENSE AGENCIES SUBTOTAL:					8,332,928
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE:	779,600	780,100	793,100		
Stockfund, Nonfuel Repricing				-2,200	
Stockfund, Fuel Repricing				-6,200	
Military Personnel, FY 1987 Increase				-8,000	
Inflation Adjustment				-4,400	
Realignment of IRR Annual Screening Funds				6,000	
TOTAL CHANGE:				-14,800	
ARMY RESERVE SUBTOTAL:					778,300

PROGRAM	FY 86 REQUEST	FY 86 FINAL	FY 87 REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
				CHANGE FROM REQUEST	RECOMMENDATION
	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE:	954,500	894,950	975,900		
Stockfund, nonfuel Repricing				-4,800	
Stockfund, Fuel Repricing				-53,800	
Civilian Personnel, FY 1987 Increase				-1,100	
Military Personnel, FY 1987 Increase				-4,100	
Inflation Adjustment				-6,600	
Realignment of IRR Annual Screening Funds				500	
TOTAL CHANGE:				-69,900	
NAVY RESERVE SUBTOTAL:					906,000
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE:	61,600	57,200	65,300		
Stockfund, Fuel Repricing				-700	
Civilian Personnel, FY 1987 Increase				-2,100	
Realignment of IRR Annual Screening Funds				500	
TOTAL CHANGE:				-2,300	
MARINE CORPS RESERVE SUBTOTAL:					63,000

				COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
PROGRAM	FY 86 REQUEST AMOUNT	FY 86 FINAL AMOUNT	FY 87 REQUEST AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE:	907,700	902,700	975,600		
Stockfund, Nonfuel Repricing				-2,200	
Stockfund, Fuel Repricing				-51,100	
Civilian Personnel, FY 1987 Increase				-16,300	
Inflation Adjustment				-2,200	
Realignment of IRR Annual Screening Funds				1,000	
TOTAL CHANGE:				-70,800	
AIR FORCE RESERVE SUBTOTAL:					904,800
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD:	1,605,200	1,652,800	1,786,900		
Stockfund, Nonfuel Repricing				-9,200	
Stockfund, Fuel Repricing				-23,200	
Civilian Personnel, FY 1987 Increase				-17,100	
Military Personnel, FY 1987 Increase				-5,800	
Inflation Adjustment				-8,800	
TOTAL CHANGE:				-64,100	
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD SUBTOTAL:					1,722,800

				COMMITTEE	RECOMMENDATION
PROGRAM	FY 86 REQUEST AMOUNT	FY 86 FINAL AMOUNT	FY 87 REQUEST AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD:	1,830,100	1,806,200	1,932,700		
Stockfund, Nonfuel Repricing				-4,600	
Stockfund, Fuel Repricing				-135,000	
Civiliam Personnel, FY 1987 Increase				-10,300	
Military Personel, FY 1987 Increase				-2,600	
Inflation Adjustment				-5,500	
TOTAL CHANGE:				-158,000	
AIR NATIONAL GUARD SUBTOTAL:					1,774,700
RIFLE PRACTICE, ARMY	920	920	930		
TOTAL CHANGE:				0	
RIFLE PRACTICE SUBTOTAL:					930

PROGRAM	FY 86 REQUEST AMOUNT	FY 86 FINAL AMOUNT	FY 87 REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT
CLAIMS, DEFENSE	158,300	143,300	155,600		
General Reduction				-10,400	
Inflation Adjustment				-1,100	
TOTAL CHANGE:				-11,500	
CLAIMS SUBTOTAL:					144,100
COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS, DEFENSE:	3,200	3,200	3,400		
General Reduction				-200	
TOTAL CHANGE:				-200	
COURT SUBTOTAL:					3,200
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FUND, DEFENSE:	0	(379,100)	385,900		
General Reduction				-10,900	
Inflation Adjustment				-4,400	
TOTAL CHANGE:				-15,300	
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION SUBTOTAL:					370,600

				COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
PROGRAM	FY 86 REQUEST AMOUNT	FY 86 FINAL AMOUNT	FY 87 REQUEST AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT
PAN AMERICAN GAMES:	0	10,000	15,000		
TOTAL CHANGE:				0	
PAN AMERICAN GAMES SUBTOTAL:					15,000
AFGHANISTAN AID	0	(10,000)	0		
Continuation of Program				10,000	
TOTAL CHANGE:				10,000	
AFGHANISTAN AID SUBTOTAL:					10,000

OTHER PROVISIONS

AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE EXCESS PERSONAL PROPERTY FOR HUMANITARIAN PURPOSES

Authority to provide excess personal property for humanitarian purposes was granted in the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (Section 1454). A number of administrative problems have arisen in the management of this effort. These problems threaten to stop or seriously impair successful delivery of the much needed personal property to United States humanitarian and civic assistance efforts.

Except for those mechanisms established to transfer excess property to the Afghan people, the Department of Defense (DOD) is required to use the existing property transfer mechanism involving the Agency for International Development (AID) Government Property Resources Division in New Cumberland, Pennsylvania. However, AID is permanently closing that office in June, 1986 and has unofficially informed DOD that they will no longer handle DOD excess or surplus property transfers. Thus, except for the Afghans, no way will exist to transfer DOD excess property until and unless the Department of State creates a new mechanism.

A second issue is that periodically the Secretary of Defense will have occasion to transfer excess property to DOD components for use in humanitarian/civic assistance projects authorized under existing law. In a country such as the Philippines, these supplies could be transferred directly from DOD excess stocks to the qualified recipient organization without time-consuming paperwork and other bureaucratic delays. Similar examples exist in other regions of the world.

This committee directs both departments to work together to set up the necessary administrative mechanisms so opportunities for use of DOD excess property in other regions of the world are not lost. All of the administrative personnel should put themselves in the position of the victims. It would be tragic indeed if the supplies and assistance were needed and available, but they were held up by bureaucratic log jams.

READINESS REPORTING

The committee remains concerned about the current status of the military capability of the United States forces and the reporting of that capability.

Numerous attempts and hearings have been made over the previous year to resolve this issue. The committee was told during a hearing in April 1986 that new indicators and reports are being designed and evaluated.

Because of the extreme difficulty in providing oversight without adequate reporting, the committee urges the Department of Defense to quickly resolve the internal service and management differences and produce new indicators, measures, and reports. The lack of this data restricts review and analysis of trends that affect readiness. Often, this practice makes it difficult to recognize declining readiness indicators prior to adverse impacts on our military capability. Correcting this deficiency will continue to be a high priority of this committee.

NAVY SHIP OVERHAUL POLICY

The committee notes with concern the decline in employment in our shipbuilding and ship repair industries. Recognizing that the Navy is the prime source of such business, Navy ship repair policy must consider the maintenance of an industrial base to accommodate mobilization needs in both the public and private sector. The committee further recognizes the difficulty of this task in view of the equally important demands of competition, ship readiness, efficient use of authorized funding, and the morale and welfare of the crews of Navy ships and their families. The committee considers that the Navy has responded in a responsible and credible manner to these competing demands. In particular, the Navy policies restricting short periods of yard work (less than six months) for deploying combatants and Navy-crewed auxiliaries to homeports have been a major benefit to crew morale and the quality of family life.

PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN STUDIES

The committee recommends a prohibition on the use of Army funds for certain studies relating to the conversion of installation operations at the Crane Army Ammunition Activity (CAAA) in Indiana and the McAlester Army Ammunition Plant (MAAP) in Oklahoma from in-house to commercial contract performance.

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

The committee recommends a reduction of $100.0 million in the administration's request for the Department of Defense Revolving and Management Funds for fiscal year 1987. Because of the relationship of these funds to the operation and maintenance account, the committee believes that, given other reductions in the financing area, this reduction is adequate. The current cash balances in these funds are at either critically low or negative balances because of worse than anticipated conditions in fiscal year 1986, committee reductions made to 1987 requests in financing cuts, and the Department of Defense building expected savings into the preparation of the fiscal year 1987 request.

The stock funds are revolving working capital funds which finance the "supply pipeline" of low-cost, demand-supported consumable items. Examples of the items financed by the stock funds are repair parts such as spark plugs and tires, other consumables such as clothing and housekeeping supplies, and minor end items such as furniture and lawnmowers.

Stock Fund assets consist of two elements: supplies and cash on hand. Customers are issued supplies using their appropriated funds. Appropriated funds received are added to the stock fund cash, which is then used to purchase replacement supplies from commercial sources.

The stock funds are not considered an appropriation fund. Obligational authority is apportioned by the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Office of Management and Budget. Congressional appropriation is required, however, to obtain additional funds to augment stock fund cash as well as to increase the inventory of war reserve materials.

Adequate funding for the stock funds is important to the maintenance of the military capability of the United States forces. The absence of the miscellaneous items procured by the stock funds, while relatively low in unit cost, can cause a shortfall which in turn can cause a weapon system to be ineffective, just as can a shortage of an expensive component purchased through the procurement accounts. Wholesale supply availability (which has generally improved in recent years) and the number of wholesale requisitions backordered (which has generally declined in recent years) are important indicators of the stock funds.

The administration requested the following amounts by service for use by the Armed Forces of the United States and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for providing capital for the Revolving and Management Funds.

				COMMITTEE	RECOMMENDATION
	FY 86 REQUEST	FY 86 FINAL	FY 87 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	RECOMMENDATION
PROGRAM	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT
REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS					
Army Stock Fund	442,000	393,000	296,700	-25,000	271,700
Navy Stock Fund	716,500	638,500	478,500	-40,000	438,500
Marine Corps Stock Fund	42,700	37,700	45,900	-4,000	41,900
Air Force Stock Fund	464,900	415,900	239,400	-20,000	219,400
Defense Stock Fund	193,500	91,700	136,800	-11,000	125,800
TOTAL - REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS	1,859,600	1,576,800	1,197,300	-100,000	1,097,300

SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY

The administration requested $3.5 million for funding in fiscal year 1987. This is an increase of $1.4 million over the fiscal year 1986 level.

No reductions in the request are recommended by the committee.

TITLE IV—PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS AND RELATED ITEMS

PART A—ACTIVE FORCES

BACKGROUND ON ACTIVE FORCES AUTHORIZATION

Since fiscal year 1972, Congress has been required by law (Public Law 91-441) to annually authorize the active duty end strength of each component of the armed forces. This requirement enhances Congressional oversight of military manpower requirements.

This year the Subcommittee on Manpower and Personnel held several hearings to receive testimony on the Department of Defense manpower request for fiscal year 1987. Based on those hearings, the Military Manpower Requirements Report, and other information, the committee has conducted a thorough analysis of fiscal year 1987 manpower requirements.

FORCE STRUCTURE CONSIDERATIONS

The force structure for fiscal year 1987 continues to be based on the Total Force Policy, which recognizes that all active and reserve units contribute to success in wartime. Active duty units comprise that portion of the total force needed for a contingency not involving mobilization, for immediate deployment in a major war before selected reserve units can be deployed, and for forward deployment in peacetime as a deterrent against conflict.

The following table is a summary of the major force elements planned for the end of fiscal year 1986 and fiscal year 1987 compared to those that existed at the end of fiscal year 1985.

SUMMARY OF MAJOR FORCE ELEMENTS

	FY 85	FY 86	FY 87
Strategic			
ICBMs	1,023	1,007	1,000
Bombers (PAA) 1/	298	314	344
Tankers (KC-135) (PAA) 1/			
Active	486	487	472
Guard/Reserve	128	128	124
Interceptor Squadrons			
Active	5	4	4
Guard/Reserve	11	11	11
Ballistic Missile Submarines (SSBNs)	37	38	39
Tactical/Mobility			
Land Forces			
Army Divisions			
Active	17	18	18
Guard	9	10 2/	10
Army Separate Brigades/Regiments			
Active 3/	10	9	9
Guard/Reserve 4/	26	24	24
Marine Corps Divisions			
Active	3	3	3
Reserve	1	1	1
Tactical Air Forces 5/			
Air Force Squadrons			
Active	130	130	132
Guard/Reserve 6/	58	60	60
Navy Squadrons			
Active	87	93	98
Reserve	15	15	15
Carriers (active only)	13	13	14
Marine Corps Squadrons			
Active	35	35	35
Reserve	10	10	11
Naval Forces			
Attack Submarines (Active only)	100	101	103
Surface Combatants			
Active	200	201	202
Reserve	12	16	20

Amphibious Assault Ships			
Active	60	60	60
Reserve	2	2	2
Patrol Ships (active only)	6	6	6
ASW and FAD Aircraft Squadrons			
Active	60	60	64
Reserve	17	18	18
Mobility Forces			
Airlift Squadrons 6/			
Active	34	34	33
Guard/Reserve	54	54	55
Sealift Ships			
Nucleus Fleet 7/	116	130	139
Chartered Fleet	20	22	21

1/ Primary aircraft authorized (PAA).

2/ One division (29th Infrantry (Light)) was activated in FY 1986 by combining the assets of two existing separate brigades that are no longer shown as separate brigades in this report.

3/ Includes one air cavalry combat brigade, the Berlin Brigade, three armored cavalry regiments and one ranger regiment. Also includes activation of the headquarters for one Armored Brigade delayed until FY 1988, the Maneuver Battalions for the Brigade are in the force structure in FY 1987.

4/ Includes five Reserve Components brigades that roundout active divisions, two Reserve Component brigades that roundup active divisions, one infantry brigade for school support upon mobilization, four theater defense brigades, and four armored cavalry regiments.

5/ Includes tactical fighter, tactical reconnaissance, special operations, tanker/cargo (KC-10), and tactical electronic warfare/tactical air control/tactical airborne command and control system squadrons. Excludes engineering heavy repair squadrons and tactical cryptographic squadrons.

6/ Includes C-130, C-141, C-5 and C-9s. Excludes rescue and weather.

7/ Includes naval fleet auxiliary force, mobility enhancement, nucleus fleet and scientific support vessels operated by the Military Sealift Command.

ACTIVE DUTY END STRENGTHS

For fiscal year 1987, the Department of Defense requested an active duty strength of 2,181,100. Most of the growth of 13,730 included in this requested level would be in the Navy (11,400).

The committee recommends an active duty end strength of 2,174,250. This level allows an increase of 6,880 over the fiscal year 1986 level but is 6,850 less than the level requested for fiscal year 1987. The committee recommendation for each military service is shown below:

Active Duty End Strengths

	Fiscal Year 1986 Level	Fiscal Year 1987 Request	1987 Committee Recommendation	Change from Request
Army	780,800	780,900	780,800	-100
Navy	581,300	592,700	587,000	-5,700
Marine Corps	198,800	200,300	199,600	-700
Air Force	606,470	607,200	606,850	-350
TOTAL	2,167,370	2,181,100	2,174,250	-6,850

QUALITY OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

In response to the relatively high numbers of individuals with low scores on the Armed Forces Qualification Test (AFQT) and without high school diplomas entering the services in fiscal year 1979 and fiscal year 1980, Congress enacted quality constraints on the military services recruiting programs beginning in fiscal year 1981. Permanent law, section 520 of title 10, United States Code, limits the number of accessions in each service who score in AFQT category IV to 20 percent in fiscal year 1983 and subsequent years. In addition, there is also a requirement that at least 65 percent of Army male non-prior service recruits must be high school graduates in fiscal year 1986.

The committee bill includes a section extending through fiscal year 1987 the requirement that at least 65 percent of Army male non-prior service recruits must be high school graduates.

ACTIVE DUTY OFFICER CORPS STRENGTH

The committee is becoming concerned about the overall size of the officer corps in each of the military services, and about the disproportionate growth in the officer corps in the last five years.

During testimony this year, the committee learned that the size of the officer corps in each of the military services has increased at a much greater rate than the overall strength of the military services over the last five years. For the Defense Department as a whole, the size of the total active duty force grew by just under 5% from fiscal year 1980 to fiscal year 1985, but the size of the officer corps increased by over 11%, over twice as much.

The table below summarizes by service the growth in total active duty end strength and the growth in total active duty officer strength from fiscal year 1980 to fiscal year 1985.

ACTIVE DUTY OFFICER CORPS

I. Total Active Duty Strength

	FY 1980	FY 1985	% Increase
Army	777,036	780,787	+.5%
Navy	527,153	579,705	+8.3%
Marine Corps	188,469	198,025	+5.1%
Air Force	557,969	601,515	+7.8%
TOTAL	2,050,627	2,151,032	+4.9%

II. Total Active Duty Officer Strength

	FY 1980	FY 1985	% Increase
Army	98,717	109,687	+11.1%
Navy	63,058	70,657	+12.1%
Marine corps	18,198	20,175	+10.9%
Air Force	97,649	108,400	+11.0%
TOTAL	277,649	308,919	+11.3%

Source: Selected Manpower Statistics, Fiscal Year 1984; FY 1987 Military Personnel Justification Books

Not only have the military services increased their officer strength at a much greater rate than their total strength in the last five years, in the case of two services the officer corps has reached the highest percentage of total active strength ever.

Officers make up 14.3% of total active Army personnel, up from 12.1% just ten years ago and the highest level since at least the 1920's.

Officers make up 18% of total active Air Force personnel, up from 17.7% ten years ago, and again, the highest level on record.

The committee is concerned that the growth in the strength of the officer corps in the last five years is less the result of hard, documented manpower requirements and more simply a reflection of improved retention. Undocumented and unjustified growth in the size of the services officer corps is very expensive, and, in the committee's view, contributes to the proliferation of redundant headquarters and overgrown staffs within the Department of Defense.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a provision which would reduce the size of the total commissioned officer corps in the Department of Defense by 2% per year for each of the next three fiscal years from the fiscal year 1986 active commissioned officer end strength. This total reduction is to be allocated among the military services by the Secretary of Defense based on his assessment of the relative priorities of the military services.

In addition, the committee bill includes a provision requiring annual authorization of the size of the commissioned officer corps in each of the military services beginning in fiscal year 1988.

PART B—RESERVE FORCES

BACKGROUND ON RESERVE FORCES AUTHORIZATION

The Reserve Forces Bill of Rights and Vitalization Act (Public Law 90-168) requires Congress to annually authorize the average minimum personnel strengths of the Selected Reserve (reservists organized in units) of each reserve component of the armed forces.

Unlike actual requirements, the average minimum strengths specified for the Selected Reserve simply represent levels which can be expected to be achieved based on projected recruiting and retention.

SELECTED RESERVE AVERAGE STRENGTHS

For fiscal year 1987, the Department of Defense requested that the authorization for Selected Reserve (including Coast Guard Reserve) personnel strengths be changed from average strengths to minimum end strengths and requested a minimum end strength of 1,192,200, an increase of 45,023 above the projected end strengths for fiscal year 1986 and an increase of 88,624 above the average strengths authorized for fiscal year 1986.

Based on budgetary considerations, the committee recommends that no increase be authorized in the strengths of this category of personnel in fiscal year 1987. In light of this recommendation, the committee does not believe it is appropriate, at this time, to change the nature of the authorization from average strengths to minimum end strengths.

The committee's recommendations are as follows:

SELECTED RESERVE PERSONNEL (AVERAGE STRENGTHS)

	Fiscal Year		1987	Change
	1986 Level	1987 Request	Committee Recommendation	from Request
Army National Guard	440,025	452,300	440,025	-12,275
Army Reserve	290,639	317,100	290,639	-26,461
Naval Reserve	134,212	147,500	134,212	-13,288
Marine Corps Reserve	41,900	42,800	41,900	-900
Air National Guard	108,700	113,100	108,700	-4,400
Air Force Reserve	75,600	78,300	75,600	-2,700
Coast Guard Reserve	12,500	13,000	12,500	-500
TOTAL	1,103,576	1,164,100	1,103,576	-60,524

FULL-TIME SUPPORT IN THE RESERVE COMPONENTS

Last year in passing the fiscal year 1986 Defense Authorization bill, the committee expressed reservations about the assignment and utilization of large numbers of full-time active duty National Guardsmen and reservists in support of National Guard and reserve units and headquarters. The committee is concerned that the compensation and benefit program available to full-time reserve and guard members is virtually identical to that available to active duty personnel, despite the different conditions of service between these two groups. In addition, the committee believes that providing full-time support for the Reserve Components by rotating Active Component personnel into National Guard and reserve units would improve the cohesion and cooperation between the Active and Reserve components.

Despite these concerns of the committee, the fiscal year 1987 budget request included an increase of 12,112, or 19%, in the number of National Guard and Reserve personnel serving on full-time active duty in the Reserve Components.

The committee bill authorizes an end strength of 64,277 for the number of reservists and National Guardsmen on full-time active duty in support of the Reserve Components in fiscal year 1987. This is the same as the fiscal year 1986 authorized level, and denies all of the increases requested in this area in the fiscal year 1987 budget. If the Reserve Components wish to fill some or all of the requested increase in full-time support in fiscal year 1987, the committee suggests the Reserve Components consider meeting this increase with a request for personnel from the active components.

Next year, in reviewing the fiscal year 1988 budget request, the committee intends to seriously consider reducing the current numbers of Reservists and National Guardsmen on full-time active duty in support of the Reserve Components and replacing these individuals with personnel from the Active Components. The committee would welcome any views that the Defense Department or the individual military services would like to provide the committee on this matter.

COUNTING OF PERSONNEL IN CERTAIN RESERVE CALL-UP SITUATIONS

Under sections 673 and 673b of title 10, United States Code, members of the reserve components can be ordered to active duty in certain situations. Each of those sections of law contains numerical limits as to the number of personnel who may be on active duty under the authority of those sections. It is likely upon the exercise of the authority contained in either of those sections that reserve component units would be ordered to active duty whose members include personnel already serving on active duty in support of the reserves.

The Department of Defense requested, and the committee has included, a provision which provides in such call-up cases that those personnel already serving on active duty in support of the reserves shall not be counted against the statutory limits in sections 673 or 673b, but such personnel may perform duty under those sections.

ACCOUNTING FOR CERTAIN RESERVE MEMBERS WITHIN PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATION

Several questions have arisen concerning how reserve personnel in certain categories are to be authorized and accounted for under the provisions of section 138(c) of title 10, United States Code. An additional problem has arisen because of the more lengthy training being required of reserve personnel as more and more missions are assumed by the reserve components. The committee has included a provision to amend section 138(c) to clarify its meaning and to accommodate the longer reserve training requirements.

Specifically, the provision first amends paragraph (1)(A) of section 138(c) to make it clear that all full-time military personnel (unless specifically excepted) must be authorized for each armed force and each component within an armed force. Additionally, the provision clarifies that the authority of the Secretary of Defense to increase by up to 0.5 percent the authorized end strength of a component of an armed force applies only to the active components and places in permanent law the Secretary of Defense's authority to increase by up to 2 percent the end strength for reserves on active duty or full-time National Guard duty in support of the reserve components.

Specifically, the provision amends section 138(c)(1)(B) to permit reserve component members on active duty for training, and members on full-time National Guard duty for 180 days or less, to be excluded from the active duty and full-time military personnel strengths. This change is required because of the increasing length of initial active duty for training, advanced technical training, flying training and professional military training in both officer and enlisted specialities in the reserve components. It is intended that reserve members on full-time duty in support of active or reserve component missions, exercises, or projects shall be ordered to active duty rather than active duty for training. Furthermore, this change makes clear that all members in full-time National Guard duty status under orders covering a period of more than 180 days must be counted against the authorization for members serving on full-time National Guard duty for the purpose of organizing, administering, recruiting, instructing or training the National Guard.

Finally, the provision amends paragraph (3)(D) of section 138(c) to require that new data be included in the annual manpower requirements report to permit congressional oversight of the use of training in excess of 180 days for members of the reserve components.

PART C—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

BACKGROUND ON CIVILIAN PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATION

Congress is required to authorize the civilian personnel end strengths requested by the Department of Defense. This requirement affords the Congress the opportunity to oversee the entire defense manpower program and the interrelationship of each component in the Total Force structure.

CATEGORIES OF CIVILIANS

The civilian end strength figures authorized by Congress represent direct and indirect hire employees, both permanent and temporary, including full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees paid from appropriated funds, who are employed to perform military functions administered by the Department of Defense. Indirect hire employees are hired by the host nation in support of U.S. forces stationed abroad. There are estimated to be approximately 87,000 such employees in fiscal year 1987. The following categories of civilian employees are excluded from the strengths recommended:

(1) Employees performing civilian functions administered by the Department of Defense, the largest of which is the Corps of Engineers Civil Works activities. For fiscal year 1987, the end strength for this function is approximately 30,000.

(2) Employment in special employment programs for students and disadvantaged youths, such as the stay-in-school campaign and the temporary summer aid program. The end strength for this program is approximately 8,500.

(3) Employees of the National Security Agency who are excluded because employment statistics are classified information.

(4) Employees paid from nonappropriated funds are not included. The approximate number of such employees is 200,000 for fiscal year 1987.

END STRENGTH MANAGEMENT

During fiscal years 1985 and 1986, Congress permitted the Department of Defense to operate, as a test program, without an authorized end strength and prohibited the use of end strength as a management tool throughout the Department. In short, the Department was not constrained in the number of personnel it could employ except as it was limited by appropriations actually made available to the Department for this purpose.

The Department of Defense has requested that it once again be permitted to operate without an authorized civilian end strength in fiscal year 1987. The committee rejects that request.

Last year this committee expressed concerns that because of various pressures the Department of Defense could not effectively control a civilian workforce of more than one million personnel without some form of end strength limitation and that Congress could not effectively exercise its oversight responsibilities without such limitations. However, because there was no data available at the time justifying those concerns, the committee acquiesced to the Department's request that it be permitted to operate without end strengths in fiscal year 1986.

Data is now available showing that the committee's earlier concerns were well justified. A report dated February 4, 1986, from the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Force Management and Personnel showed that in fiscal year 1985, the first year the Department operated without end strength constraints, its actual employment of civilians at the end of that fiscal year exceeded its February 1985 estimate by 41,256. Additionally, its preliminary estimate of expenditures for civilian manpower in fiscal year 1985 exceeded its February 1985 estimate of those expenditures by more than $800,000,000. While a number of claims of savings were made in that report, when the Assistant Secretary was questioned by the Manpower and Personnel Subcommittee during a hearing on this subject, no objective cost analysis could be cited to support those claims. The Assistant Secretary also was unable to explain why the actual employment and actual expenditure levels exceeded midyear Departmental estimates. Furthermore, a report from the Assistant Secretary dated May 22, 1986, detailing civilian employment statistics for the first quarter of fiscal year 1986, indicates that the Department employed some 31,000 more personnel than it planned for this fiscal year.

For these reasons, the committee believes it is essential to once again impose a civilian end strength within the Department of Defense as well as a limit on the funds which may be obligated in support of those personnel, in order to force the Department to regain control of this workforce.

FISCAL YEAR 1987 CIVILIAN END STRENGTH

In its fiscal year 1987 request, the Department of Defense has assumed a civilian workforce of approximately 1,114,616. The committee recommends a civilian end strength of 1,084,836, the workforce size requested in fiscal year 1985 and a limit on obligations for such personnel of $31,811,640,000.

REPORTS RELATING TO PROPOSED INCREASED CIVILIAN PERSONNEL UTILIZATION

One of the most disturbing trends which developed during the fiscal year 1985 test which permitted the Department of Defense to operate without civilian end strengths (discussed earlier in this report) was the number of instances in which functions being performed for the Department of Defense by the private sector were converted to performance by government employees without any detailed cost analysis being performed to justify such conversions.

In order to insure that such conversions are not made in the future without a proper and thorough analysis of the cost and other economic effects of such conversions, the committee has recommended a provision which would require that a detailed analysis be made of such proposed conversions before they are undertaken. The required analysis would be very similar to that required before conversion from in-house to private sector performance is permitted. Such an analysis would not be required in time of war or national emergency or when the Secretary of Defense personally certifies that such a conversion is required in the interest of national security.

PART D—MILITARY TRAINING STUDENT LOADS

BACKGROUND ON MILITARY TRAINING STUDENT LOADS AUTHORIZATION

The fiscal year 1973 Defense Department Authorization Act (Public Law 92-436) requires Congress to annually authorize average military training student loads. Training loads represent the average number of military personnel attending formal military training courses on any given day during the year. These loads do not include training conducted in the field or in combat units where personnel train as crews or units. Included are the following types of training.

(1) Recruit training includes all basic initial enlisted training for all services for both active and reserve components. In all services, it represents an introduction of the new enlisted man or woman into military life.

(2) Officer acquisition training includes training programs through which officers are developed, such as the service military academies, the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, Officer Candidate Schools, and enlisted commissioning programs.

(3) Specialized training provides both officer and enlisted personnel with skills and knowledge necessary to perform specific jobs or to operate or maintain specific pieces of equipment.

(4) The Army's One Station Unit Training (OSUT) program combines recruit training and initial skill training for certain skills into a single continuous course.

(5) Flight training provides the basic undergraduate flying skills for pilots, navigators, and naval flight officers. This category does not include the major formal advanced combat training programs which are beyond the scope of this authorization since they are conducted by and for operational units. However, some flight-related skills, such as those of the Air Force navigator, bombardier, and electronic warfare officer, are included.

(6) Professional training includes military education, graduate education, degree completion education, and professional development courses not leading to a degree. This training is accomplished at both military and civilian institutions and includes senior service schools, staff colleges, advanced degree programs, Department of Defense schools such as the Defense Systems Management School, and enlisted leadership training.

MILITARY TRAINING STUDENT LOADS AUTHORIZATION

The committee recommends approval of the military training student loads requested by the Department of Defense.

The Secretary of Defense shall adjust these training loads for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force components so that they are consistent with the manpower strengths authorized in other parts of this bill.

The committee's recommendations are as follows:

MILITARY TRAINING STUDENT LOADS, FISCAL YEAR 1986, BY COMPONENT AND MAJOR TRAINING CATEGORY

	RECRUIT TRAINING	ONE-STATION UNIT TRAINING	OFFICER ACQUISITION TRAINING	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	FLIGHT TRAINING	PROFESSION DEVELOPMT EDUCATION
Active Forces	13,540	12,290	5,335	43,810	1,265	3,446
Army	13,540	12,290	5,335	43,810	1,265	3,446
Navy	15,015	-	6,924	45,015	1,960	2,104
Marine Corps	8,082	-	269	11,050	527	838
Air Force	8,047	-	6,401	22,221	2,806	3,914
Subtotal	44,684	12,290	18,929	122,096	6,558	10,302
Reserve Components:						
Army Reserve	4,788	2,236	4	9,762	108	87
Army Nat'l Reserve	3,741	6,394	44	8,420	232	55
Naval Reserve	1,513	-	0	1,800	0	42
Marine Corps Reserve	2,117	-	190	1,451	0	32
Air Force Reserve	443	-	14	1,497	85	79
Air Nat'l Guard	677	-	0	1,790	240	44
Subtotal	13,279	8,630	252	24,720	665	339
Total	57,963	20,920	19,181	146,816	7,223	10,641

Part E—Manpower Analyses

MANPOWER REPORTS ON MAJOR DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROGRAMS

For some time, the committee has been concerned with an inability to properly consider the manpower requirements associated with major defense acquisition programs during the development and procurement decision stages of these programs. This has resulted with the Congress being confronted with unexpected manpower requirements to permit the proper operation, maintenance, and support of new weapons systems only after the systems have been fully developed, procured, and fielded.

In order to permit the committee to make more knowledgeable decisions concerning the development and acquisition of such systems, the committee has included a provision which requires the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Committees on Armed Services, at least 90 days in advance of his decisions regarding full-scale engineering development and production and deployment of such systems, a report detailing the manpower requirements associated with such systems along with a plan for full operational deployment of such systems if no increase in personnel were authorized for the periods when deployment would occur.

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

ASSIGNMENT OF PERSONNEL OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Section 671 of title 10, United States Code, prohibits the assignment of military personnel outside the United States until the completion of basic training (or its equivalent) of a period of not less than 12 weeks. This provision was originally intended to insure that personnel were not shipped into combat situations without sufficient training to equip them for combat.

However, the course of basic training today may in fact be less than a full twelve weeks. Many skills are learned without additional formal training, but rather are learned solely through on-the-job training. In those cases, individuals who are slated for overseas assignment must merely be held at the basic training location until the expiration of the twelve week period. This results in costs to the government while the individual is not being productively utilized.

The committee therefore has included a provision to amend section 671 of title 10 to permit the overseas assignment of personnel after completion of basic training which need not be a full 12 weeks. However, this provision would not apply in time of war or national emergency.

TREATMENT OF EXCESS LEAVE AT REENLISTMENT

Under existing law (section 701 of title 10, United States Code, and section 502(b) of title 37, United States Code) personnel who take leave in excess of that to which they are entitled under section 701 of title 10 must at the time of discharge repay the government for that excess leave. This is true even in cases when the discharge is for the purpose of immediate reenlistment for a period during which the excess leave could be "recouped" by the earning of additional leave which is not taken.

In order to provide additional flexibility to members who may have had to take such excess leave during one enlistment, the committee recommends a provision which would permit such a negative leave balance to be carried over into a new period of enlistment and would permit such members to not have to pay for such excess leave at the time of discharge, if the discharge was for the purpose of accepting an appointment, warrant, or entering into an enlistment or extension of an enlistment.

EXTENSION OF NAVY SPOT PROMOTION AUTHORITY

The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to temporarily promote certain Navy lieutenants to lieutenant commander. Individuals promoted under this "spot" authority are line lieutenants who possess skills for which there is a critical shortage. In addition, they must serve in positions which are designated to be held by lieutenant commanders and are in need of the skills possessed by the person to be promoted. Under current secretarial regulations, this authority is used only for ship and submarine engineering positions.

Although the Navy is attempting to enhance other incentives for engineering duty, its spot promotion authority remains an important tool for filling engineering positions aboard ships and submarines. Therefore, the committee recommends that this authority be extended for 2 years beyond its current expiration date of September 30, 1986. Promotions made under this authority would continue to be subject to the grade ceilings for lieutenant commanders set forth in subsection 523(a)(2) of title 10, United States Code.

CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO RETAIN ARMY RESERVE BRIGADIER GENERALS IN ACTIVE STATUS UNTIL AGE 60

Section 513 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1985 (Public Law 98-525) added a new subsection (c) to section 3851 of title 10, United States Code, to permit the Secretary of the Army to retain in active status until age 60 up to 10 reserve brigadier generals. As part of that change, the preexisting subsection (c) of section 3851 was redesignated subsection (d).

Section 522(a)(2) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (Public Law 99-145), which was designed to amend the text of the subsection of section 3851 which previously had been subsection (c) but had been redesignated subsection (d), unintentionally deleted the authority of the Secretary of the Army to retain such officers in active status.

To correct this error, the committee has recommended a provision which amends section 522(a)(2) to read as it was originally intended to read and makes that amendment effective as though originally enacted as part of Public Law 99-145. This provision will restore the secretary's authority to retain in active status until age 60 up to 10 Army reserve brigadier generals.

INCREASED PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITY TO AUGMENT ACTIVE FORCES WITH THE SELECTED RESERVE

Section 673b of title 10, United States Code, presently permits the President to order to active duty not more than 100,000 members of the Selected Reserve for a period of up to 90 days to augment the active forces. This authority can be exercised without a declaration of war or national emergency.

In exercises conducted by the Department of Defense, scenarios have developed in which the 100,000 man limitation has been found to be inadequate and could result in the armed forces being unable to adequately prepare for possible full mobilization later.

The committee therefore has recommended a provision that would increase the limit now contained in section 673b of title 10 from 100,000 to 250,000 Selected Reserve personnel, and which permits the President, in cases where he determines such action is necessary in the interests of national security, to extend the present 90 day period contained in section 673b of title 10. The President would be required to immediately notify Congress of any decision to extend the 90 day period, and Congress would retain its existing authority in section 673b to terminate the active duty of all personnel on duty under that section by concurrent resolution.

INVOLUNTARY ORDER TO ACTIVE DUTY OF RESERVE PERSONNEL IN CAPTIVE STATUS

The increasing use of reserve component forces to augment the active forces along with escalating terrorist activity by individuals and governments has increased the risk that members of the reserve components may become the targets of terrorist acts. When TWA flight 847 was hijacked on June 14, 1985, a reserve officer returning to the United States was among the military personnel held hostage. That officer, like most reserve personnel performing active duty, was only on active duty for a short period of time and he was under orders terminating his active duty on a date certain. His tour of duty would have expired during his captivity were it not for an anomaly in travel regulations which permitted the government to extend his travel time, since his travel was delayed by circumstances beyond his control.

In order to address this type of situation the Department of Defense has requested authority to involuntary order to active duty any reserve component member who is determined to be in a missing status as defined by section 551(2) of title 37, United States Code.

The committee is generally supportive of the request of the Department of Defense, but is concerned that such authority not be utilized unless the reservist's status as a member of the armed forces is related to the member being the object of the hostile actions. Therefore, the committee has recommended a provision which would permit reservists to be involuntarily ordered to active duty whenever the reservist is in a captive status. Captive status would be defined as being in a missing status, as defined by section 551(2) of title 37, which arises because of hostile actions and is related to the member's military status. The committee provision adopts the Department's recommendation that no member ordered to active duty under the provision may be retained on active duty, without the member's consent, for more than 30 days after the captive status terminates.

TECHNICAL CORRECTION RELATING TO PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION AT AIR FORCE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

The Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986, (Public Law 99-145) included a provision (Section 536) that would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to classify and pay civilian employees of the Air Force Institute of Technology without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and 53 of title 5, United States Code. The purpose of this provision was to exempt civilian faculty members of the Air Force Institute of Technology from the general schedule classification and compensation and to grant the Secretary of the Air Force the authority to establish compensation schedules for the civilian faculty of the Air Force Institute of Technology comparable to other Federal degree granting institutions.

The committee bill recommends a technical change to this authority enacted last year for the Armed Forces Institute of Technology. This technical change would replace the term "rates of basic pay" with the word "pay". This technical change is necessary to insure that the Secretary of the Air Force has the authority to establish an effective performance management recognition system for the Air Force Institute of Technology similar to those established at other Federal degree granting institutions, including the U.S. Naval Academy, the U.S. Naval War College, the Naval Postgraduate School, the U.S. Coast Guard Academy, and the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

TERMINATION OF GENDER-BASED DISTINCTIONS IN PROMOTIONS OF OFFICERS IN THE NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS RESERVE

Existing law does not permit women officers in the Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve to compete for promotion above the rank of Navy captain or Marine Corps colonel. In addition, existing law restricts women officers in most competitive categories in the Naval Reserve, and women officers in the Marine Corps Reserve compete only among themselves for promotion. No similar restrictions exist in law for women officers of the reserve components of the Army and Air Force.

The Defense Officer Personnel Management Act (Public Law 96-513) eliminated gender-based promotion selection board distinctions for officers on the active duty list of the Navy. It also removed limitations on the promotion of women on the active duty list to ranks above Navy captain and Marine Corps colonel. The Department of the Navy now has requested that the remaining gender-based promotion distinctions for reserve officers be eliminated from the law.

The committee, therefore, has recommended a provision which will amend the four sections of law that presently mandate these gender-based distinctions. The amendments will end these distinctions in the promotion process and eliminate the current requirement for women to compete in a separate category from their male counterparts in selection boards for promotion to the same grade. The amendments also would allow men and women in the reserve components of the naval services to compete for promotion through the grade of rear admiral and lieutenant general without restriction.

SENATE CONFIRMATION OF CERTAIN GENERAL OFFICER POSITIONS

There are a small number of military positions authorized in law in which an incumbent is entitled to a specific flag or general officer grade, without Senate confirmation. The committee believes officers appointed to these positions should be promoted to the specified grade only if the President appoints them to that grade, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as is the case for all other flag or general officer appointments.

Therefore, the committee has recommended a provision which would require Presidential appointment, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to the grade specified in law, if an incumbent to one of these positions is to serve in that grade. The positions affected by this provision are (1) Dean of the Academic

BEST COPY [illegible]

Board of the United States Military Academy; (2) Deputy Judge Advocate General of the Navy; (3) Assistant Judge Advocates General of the Navy; (4) Dean of the Faculty of the United States Air Force Academy; and (5) the Attending Physician to the United States Congress. The committee provision would apply only to future appointments to these positions.

POSITION OF STAFF JUDGE ADVOCATE TO THE COMMANDANT OF THE MARINE CORPS

The Marine Corps has asked that the position of Staff Judge Advocate to the Commandant be provided for in statute. The incumbent of this position serves as the legal advisor to the Commandant, as well as oversees those Marine Corps officers designated as judge advocates by the Judge Advocate General of the Navy. This position has historically been known as the Director, Judge Advocate Division and has been filled by a brigadier general or brigadier general selectee.

The committee agrees that this position is one of significance and should be established by statute. Therefore, the committee reported bill includes a provision which would establish the position of Staff Judge Advocate to the Commandant of the Marine Corps, with the officer being appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. If so appointed, the officer would, while so serving, hold the grade of brigadier general. This provision does not authorize any increase in the total number of flag and general officers which may be serving on active duty in the armed forces, and it does not authorize any additional general officers for the Marine Corps.

TEMPORARY INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF GENERAL AND FLAG OFFICERS AUTHORIZED TO BE ON ACTIVE DUTY IN CERTAIN GRADES

In March 1982, the Department of Defense submitted to Congress a comprehensive legislative proposal to change the management of flag and general officers. However, neither the House nor the Senate Committee on Armed Services has yet had an opportunity to formally consider the proposal. In the meantime, the Defense Department has continued to operate under a statutory ceiling which authorizes it no more than 1,073 flag and general officers. The ceiling became effective on October 1, 1981.

The number of lieutenant generals/vice admirals and generals/admirals in each service is derived from a statutory formula based on a service's total number of flag and general officers. The Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1985, contained authority for the Air Force to have one more general, for the Navy to have three more vice admirals, and for the Marine Corps to have one more lieutenant general and one more general (the additional general contingent on a Marine Corps general being assigned as Commander-in-Chief of the U.S. Central Command) than would be authorized under this statutory percentage formula.

The Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (Public Law 99-145) continued the authority for these additional positions through the end of fiscal year 1986, as well as providing authority for one additional Army lieutenant general during any period of fiscal year 1986 when an Army officer was serving as the Director of the Department of Defense Task Force on Drug Enforcement.

The committee recommends that authority for each of the additional positions authorized in fiscal year 1986 be extended through fiscal year 1987, except that the authority for one additional Air Force general should exist only when an Air Force general is serving as Director of the Strategic Defense Initiative Organization.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

PART A—BASIC PAY AND ALLOWANCES

MILITARY PAY RAISE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1987

The Department of Defense has proposed a four percent increase in basic pay and basic allowance for subsistence for all personnel and a restructuring of the basic allowance for quarters amounting to an average increase of four percent, all to be effective on October 1, 1986. The Department also proposes a four percent increase in cadet and midshipmen pay which has not been increased since October 1982.

Military pay levels continue to lag behind comparable civilian wages. As measured by the Employment Cost Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, military pay trails civilian wages by 8.3 percent. Without a four percent increase in military pay during fiscal year 1987, it is likely that this gap will grow even larger. The committee believes that, even in light of the severe budget constraints being imposed on defense, it is essential that military pay not be permitted to fall further behind civilian wages.

Therefore, the committee recommends approval of the Department's request for a four percent military pay raise effective October 1, 1986.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR ACCOMMODATIONS IN PLACE OF QUARTERS

In 1980, Congress authorized the Navy to reimburse certain enlisted members for the housing expenses they incur when their shipboard quarters are uninhabitable during overhaul. If government quarters ashore, a berthing barge, or government-leased quarters are unavailable, crew members must pay for housing on the private residential market. The reimbursement paid to these individuals is not to exceed the quarters allowance of a member of the same grade without dependents plus the variable housing allowance which could be paid at the location where shipboard quarters are unavailable.

Because the Navy's authority to pay this reimbursement will expire at the end of fiscal year 1986, and it appears the need for this authority will continue for some time in the future, the committee recommends extension of the authority until September 30, 1991. Reimbursements under this authority could not exceed $1,657,000 a year during fiscal years 1987-1991.

ADVANCE PAY FOR SENIOR ROTC MEMBERS IN CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES

Before members of the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) program may be commissioned, they must complete field training or a practice cruise. These "summer camps" or "summer cruises" are conducted with members being ordered to active duty for training for approximately four weeks, for which members are entitled to pay and appropriate allowances.

Quite often Senior ROTC members must incur expenses in the course of reporting for and participating in this training. Additionally, many of the active duty locations where training is performed are not equipped to deal with the disbursal of cadet or midshipman pay. It would be beneficial to both the ROTC members and the services concerned if the pay for these members could be paid in advance. Therefore, the committee recommends an amendment to section 1006 of title 37, United States Code, to permit the payment to cadets and midshipmen in advance of field training or practice cruises.

TERMINATION OF PAY INEQUITY BETWEEN OFFICERS AND PERSONNEL FORMERLY ENLISTED IN CERTAIN HEALTH PROFESSIONS TRAINING

Sections 2114(b) and 2121(c) of title 10, United States Code, provide that students attending the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences (USUHS) and students enrolled in the Armed Forces Health Professions Scholarship (AFHPS) program, respectively, shall serve on active duty in the pay grade of O-1. Students at USUHS serve on active duty throughout their studies there and students enrolled in the AFPHS program must serve on active duty for 45 days during each year of enrollment of the program.

These provisions do not, however, result in all students receiving pay under the same pay tables. Public Law 85-422 authorized officers in pay grades O-1, O-2, and O-3 with over four years prior service as enlisted members to be paid at a higher rate than officers without such prior service. Public Law 96-343 expanded that enhanced benefit by permitting the counting of prior warrant officer service, as well as prior enlisted service, in determining if the higher rate was authorized. This benefit was designed to encourage enlisted and warrant officer personnel to become officers. Personnel having such previous service are paid at rates known as O-1E, O-2E, and O-3E, each of which increase at two-years-of-service increments. However, officers without prior enlisted or warrant officer service are paid at pay grades O-1, O-2, and O-3. Students enrolled in USUHS and the AFHPS program serve as O-1's. Pay grade O-1 increases only through three years of service and does not increase thereafter. In short, under today's pay tables, a student at USUHS with over four years prior enlisted service will be paid $1,645.20 a month in basic pay while a student with over four years of commissioned officer service will be paid $1,540.20 in basic pay.

The committee believes that this difference in pay between these health professions students should end. Inasmuch as the opportunity to receive a medical education at government expense is one of the most attractive benefits available to military personnel, and because the committee understands that there is a very high demand from both officer and enlisted personnel for enrollment in both USUHS and the AFHPS program, the committee has determined that the enhanced pay normally offered to prior enlisted and warrant officer personnel when they become officers is not necessary to encourage such personnel to become officers through these two health professionals training programs. Therefore, the committee has recommended a provision that provides that while in these programs, active duty pay for all personnel shall be at the O-1, and not the O-1E, rate. This change will not apply to personnel presently enrolled in either program, or to those who have been selected to attend USUHS or who have signed an agreement to participate in the AFHPS program.

PART B—TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION

IMPROVED DISLOCATION ALLOWANCE

The dislocation allowance, first authorized in 1955, is designed to defray the cost of incidental expenses which arise when a member is ordered to make a permanent change of station (PCS) move. The amount of the dislocation allowance is established in law as the amount equal to two months basic allowance for quarters for the pay grade and dependency status of the member.

Presently, a dislocation allowance is payable when (1) the member's dependents actually move incident to the member's PCS move; (2) when the member's dependents actually move incident to an evacuation of dependents; and (3) when the member is without dependents and the member actually moves to a new permanent duty station where he is not assigned quarters.

The committee recognizes that there are other circumstances which arise in conjunction to a member being ordered to make a PCS move in which the member incurs incidental expenses. The Department of Defense has asked that the dislocation allowance be enhanced to embrace some of these circumstances and the committee has recommended a provision which will authorize the payment of the dislocation allowance under the three circumstances described above as well as five other sets of circumstances. These additional circumstances are (1) when the member's dependents actually move pursuant to section 406(e) of title 37, United States Code, under unusual or emergency circumstances and no PCS orders providing authority for such movement have been issued; (2) when the member's dependents actually move, pursuant to section 406(h) of title 37, when the secretary concerned determines it is in the best interests of the member or the dependents and the United States; (3) when the member's dependents actually move after the member is reported dead, injured, ill, or absent in a missing status for more than 29 days; (4) when the member's dependents, or (5) a member without dependents, actually begin some travel pursuant to PCS orders before the orders' effective date and the orders are then cancelled, modified or revoked requiring the dependents, or the member without dependents being required, to return to the original duty station or to another duty station.

Additionally, the provision would authorize a dislocation allowance to be paid when a member performs consecutive overseas tours at the same location but one of these tours is with dependents and one of the tours is without dependents.

While the committee believes that members should not be required to absorb all the costs of moves made under the circumstances described in the committee provision, it also believes that many of the circumstances described could be avoided by effective management of PCS travel orders. Therefore, the committee expects that the new authority contained in its provision should be necessary only rarely.

OVERSEAS TRANSPORTATION OF PRIVATELY OWNED VEHICLES

Section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, provides authority for the movement of member's privately owned motor vehicles to and from overseas by the government. Generally, these vehicles may be moved by the government only between customary ports of embarkation and debarkation. That is, members must transport the vehicle to the port of embarkation, the government moves the vehicle from that port to the port of debarkation, and the member must transport the vehicle from that location to the new duty station.

The committee has recommended three provisions which will alter this scheme in certain circumstances. One of the provisions will permit the government to transport the vehicle to or from the ports and to or from the member's duty station when it is determined that the member's transportation of the vehicle would pose a threat to security or the member's personal safety or would be dangerous because of inadequate road, terrain, weather or similar adverse conditions. A second of the provisions would permit government transportation of these vehicles from old duty stations to new duty stations (one of which is overseas), when the member's permanent change of station move is incident to a unit size movement.

The third provision amends section 2634 to permit shipment of privately owned vehicles (POV's) at government expense from the ports in Northern Europe to one or more inland processing points. Currently, section 2634 limits shipment of POV's at government expense between "customary ports of embarkation and debarkation." As a result, POV's are shipped from the United States to Bremerhaven. The service member must then travel to Bremerhaven on temporary duty (TDY), pick up his vehicle and return to his duty station. Since most servicemen are stationed in southern portions of the Federal Republic of Germany, this represents substantial loss of duty time to these individuals and an expense to the government in payment for their travel.

Therefore, the Department of Defense requested a change in section 2634 to permit shipment of POV's at government expense to a point closer to the duty stations in southern Germany.

The committee believes that the Secretary of Defense should be given the flexibility to ship POVs to one or more inland points if that will result in reduced time for service members away from their units and cost savings to the government. However, the Department of Defense did not make any requests for military construction funds necessary to build the processing center at any inland point. Accordingly, the committee directs that the Secretary of Defense submit a report to the House and Senate Committees on

Armed Services by January 15, 1987, containing a detailed analysis of the implementation of this section. The report should contain a cost analysis including any construction costs associated with relocating the processing point from an ocean port to one or more inland points. The report should also address the views expressed by any NATO government on this issue.

TRANSPORTATION AND STORAGE OF HOUSEHOLD GOODS

The committee recommends two provisions dealing with shipment and storage of household goods and privately owned vehicles.

Presently, under certain circumstances, members are authorized long term storage of household goods up to a published maximum weight limit, which varies by grade. Often, it is discovered that the household goods stored by a member exceed that authorized maximum weight, but this is not likely to be discovered until after the goods are stored and the warehouseman has presented the government with the first bill for storage. There is no authority for the government to pay for the costs for this excess storage, and the member, often at a distant location, is faced with an administrative nightmare. Under these circumstances, the member must contract directly with the warehouseman to separate the stored goods into two lots so the government lot does not exceed the maximum weight allowed and must contract for storage of the second lot, usually at higher rates than the government contract rate.

To alleviate this type of problem, the committee has included in the bill a provision which would permit the government in these circumstances to pay the costs of the excess storage and collect those costs from the member directly. This authority would be similar to that in section 3726 of title 31, United States Code, when excess household goods are transported.

Another problem involving transportation of household goods arises when a member being assigned overseas ships household goods and vehicles in advance of the member's family actually moving to the overseas station. This is both reasonable and customary, as it can help assure that the goods arrive at or near the same time as the member and family arrive at the overseas station.

Occasionally, some unexpected and uncontrollable event, such as sickness, occurs which prevents the dependents from actually moving to the overseas station. This can result in the dependents in the United States being without needed household goods and the member in the overseas location having the goods but being unable to utilize them. There presently is no authority to rectify this problem, until the member is ordered to make another permanent change of station move. Therefore, the committee has included a provision which would permit an immediate return shipment of the household goods, and motor vehicle, if appropriate.

CONTINGENT AUTHORIZATION FOR FLAT RATE PER DIEM SYSTEM

The Department of Defense has requested a change in the method of reimbursement of member's subsistence expenses while traveling and the removal of statutory ceilings on subsistence payments in the continental United States.

Presently, members are reimbursed either through an average cost of lodgings method or an actual expense reimbursement method. Under the requested change, members would receive a per diem based on a prescribed flat rate, which varies by locality, for meals and incidentals plus reimbursement for actual lodging. The total for meals and lodging would not exceed a preestablished local rate. The Federal Civilian Employees and Contractor Travel Expenses Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-234), establishes such a system for Federal civilian employees, effective July 1986.

The committee believes the per diem system for military personnel should be brought in line with that for civilian employees. However, it is concerned that the Department of Defense has been unable to provide validated data to show the budgetary impact of the requested change. The committee has, therefore, included a provision that makes the requested change, but those changes would only apply during fiscal years for which the Department of Defense has certified that the new calculation method will not result in costs to the government in excess of the costs the government would incur under the existing calculation method.

TRAVEL EXPENSES FOR DEPENDENTS OVERSEAS WHO REQUIRE MEDICAL CARE IN CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES

Section 1040 of title 10, United States Code, authorizes government transportation of dependents who are accompanying members stationed outside the continental United States and who require medical care not available at the duty location, to the nearest appropriate medical facility where the case is available. this section does not authorize payment by the government of travel expenses, such as meals, lodging, or incidentals while being transported. Additionally, the section does not authorize payment of such expenses in those cases when the dependent is discharged from the medical facility, but required to remain in that locality for follow-up treatment. Such travel expenses can be paid by the government for any attendants who may be accompanying the dependent.

The committee believes this is an area in which improvements are needed. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision which would authorize government reimbursement for travel expenses of the dependent while being transported to and from the medical facility, as well as while in the locality of the medical facility, if remaining in that locality is required for continuing care.

AUTHORIZATION LIMIT ON FUNDS FOR PCS TRAVEL

The committee recommends a provision authorizing the appropriation of not more than $2,657,553,000 for permanent change of travel for active duty military personnel.

This level is $145,000,000 below that requested in the President's budget and results from a number of changes identified by the Department of Defense which can be made in the administration of permanent change of station travel payments. The committee provision is designed to insure that those changes are put into effect, thereby reducing the level of funding needed by $145,000,000.

Part C—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays

ENHANCED AVIATION OFFICER CONTINUATION PAY (AOCP)

As part of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1981, a new continuation bonus for aviation officers was authorized in an effort to improve serious manning shortages in these skills. It was clear that Congress intended this special pay to be a short-term bonus targeted to only critical aviation skills. In the intervening years Congress has placed statutory limits on this special pay in attempts to insure that it be utilized as very targeted special pay, as it was intended, and not as a component of career compensation for all aviators. Presently, authority exists for the payment of this special pay only to Navy aviators in aviation communities where actual shortages truly exist.

The Department of Defense has requested a number of changes to this special pay authority which if enacted would add $3,000,000 to the cost of the program in fiscal year 1987, rising to $14,000,000 in fiscal year 1991. At the same time the Navy is expecting a slightly higher resignation rate among its pilots than it had during fiscal year 1985.

The committee is aware that the Secretary of the Navy has recently announced a series of administrative changes designed to enhance morale among sea-going aviators, where family separation remains the single strongest factor leading to resignations. The committee is generally supportive of these changes as it appears that morale enhancement may, in the long run, be more likely to prevent pilot resignations than will additional compensation.

At the same time, the committee does believe that some of the enhancements requested by the Department of Defense can and should be made this year to help retard aviator separations. Therefore, the committee has recommended a provision approving two of the requested enhancements to AOCP. Specifically, under present law, recipients of AOCP may be paid Aviation Career Incentive Pay (ACIP) (a career compensation element for aviators), but only at the rates in effect on September 30, 1981.

This has the effect of reducing ACIP for AOCP recipients by $1,128 a year. The committee provisions would terminate that reduction for those entering into service agreements under AOCP on or after October 1, 1986. This will increase the value of this special pay by $1,128 a year.

Secondly, under present law, only aviators with less than seven years of active duty may sign an agreement to remain on active duty for six years and receive AOCP at a rate of $6,000 a year for each of those six years. The Department of Defense has requested that this "window" be expanded to include those with less than eight years of active duty. The committee concurs with that request and recommends this change.

INCLUSION OF AVIATION CADETS UNDER AVIATION CAREER INCENTIVE PAY (ACIP) PROGRAM

Aviation Career Incentive Pay (ACIP) is authorized by section 301a of title 37, United States Code, and is designed to be a career compensation element for those who make aviation their career.

When that program was enacted, all aviators in the Department of Defense, including those in aviation training were either commissioned or warrant officers.

The Navy has now reinstituted a Navy Aviation Cadet (NAVCAD) program under the authority of section 6911 of title 10, United States Code. Under ACIP, certain milestones based on years of aviation service are used in determining continued eligibility for that pay. The 12 to 18 months spent in flight training is creditable as aviation service, but only if the student is an officer. This creates a substantial disincentive for enlisted personnel to pursue their aviation training through the NAVCAD program because the time spent in training will be lost throughout their later careers for purposes of determining eligibility for ACIP.

The Navy is commended for instituting the NAVCAD program and the Air Force is urged to consider such a program. In order to insure that a disincentive does not continue to exist under ACIP for such a program, the committee recommends a provision which includes aviation cadets within the definition of officer for all purposes under the ACIP program.

PAYMENT OF SELECTED RESERVE ENLISTMENT BONUS

Section 642 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (Public Law 99-145) extended the termination date of the period during which the Selected Reserve enlistment bonus could be paid, under section 308c of title 37, United States Code, from September 30, 1985, to September 30, 1987. Public Law 99-145 was enacted on November 8, 1986. The Department of Defense, based on decisions of the Supreme Court and the Comptroller General on similar issues, has determined that there was no authority to pay a Selected Reserve enlistment bonus to persons entering the reserves between October 1, 1985 and November 8, 1985. It has taken a similar position with respect to payment of the Selected Reserve reenlistment, affiliation, and Individual Ready Reserve bonuses, all of which authority to extend beyond September 30, 1985, was contained in Public Law 99-145. The Department of Defense took this position prior to September 30, 1985, and all reserve components were advised in advance that payment of these bonuses would not be authorized after September 30, 1985, pending enactment of legislation extending authority for such bonuses.

The committee has now learned that while most reserve components fully implemented these instructions, there were a number of individuals who enlisted in the Selected Reserve during this October 1-November 8, 1985, time period who were promised payment of a bonus, notwithstanding the lack of authority to make such promises. It appears that the Army National Guard resisted the instructions given to the reserve components, and as a result individuals were misled about their right to receive a bonus upon enlistment.

The committee further understands that many individuals who enlisted during the period in question have subsequently been permitted to reenlist or extend their enlistment so as to qualify for payment of a bonus. However, in order to insure that individuals who were promised, albeit without authority, a Selected Reserve enlistment bonus for an enlistment during the period of October 1-November 8, 1985, and who have not been subsequently paid an enlistment bonus, the committee has included a provision which would permit the payment of such a bonus upon a determination by the secretary concerned that the member enlisted during that period with the good faith belief that such a bonus would be paid.

The committee notes, however, that it will be extremely cautious in extending such authority in the future, if as in this case, it is clear that the components of the Armed Services were given clear advance guidance concerning the lack of authority to make or promise to make payments to individuals under similar circumstances.

SPECIAL PAY FOR MEMBERS PROFICIENT IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES

The committee has been advised that there is an urgent need to enhance the foreign language capabilities of the armed forces. Currently, the Department of State, the National Security Agency and the Central Intelligence Agency each have a special pay program designed to motivate personnel to maintain and enhance foreign language proficiencies. The need for such proficiency in the armed forces is increasing because of the greater cooperation with allies required by our global commitments, because of the need for greater usage of special operations forces, and because of increasing demands for military intelligence.

In order to meet this need, the committee recommends the authorization of a new special pay for foreign language proficiency. Under the committee provision, a member who has been certified as proficient in a foreign language identified by the Secretary of Defense as necessary for national defense and who is (1) qualified in a military speciality or performing military duties requiring such proficiency; (2) receiving training to enhance such proficiency; or (3) is proficient in a foreign language for which the Department of Defense has an unusually critical need may be paid the special pay of not more than $100 a month.

The committee has also included in its provision a limitation that not more than $7,300,000 may be obligated or expended during fiscal year 1987 for this special pay. While the committee supports the establishment of this new special pay, it is concerned that it be used in a judicious manner to insure capabilities only for essential needs. The committee will continue to review the limitations on obligations under this new program for a number of years during implementation to insure this type of use.

SPECIAL PAY FOR BOARD CERTIFIED PSYCHOLOGISTS

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense and the military departments continue to resist the full utilization of non-physician providers in providing health care services, especially at this time when there are substantial shortages of physicians in all components of the armed forces. The committee also notes that continued practice of requiring physicians to perform many functions which can legally, ethically, and actually be provided by nonphysician providers creates unnecessary demand for physician services and produces low morale among non-physician providers.

This problem is especially acute with respect to the utilization of psychologists by the armed forces. In order to attempt to bring about a rethinking of this problem, while at the same time encouraging well qualified psychologists to enter and remain on active duty, the committee recommends the creation of a special pay for the most highly qualified psychologists.

Under the committee provision, psychologists who have been awarded a diploma as a Diplomate in Psychology by the American Board of Professional Psychology would be entitled to special pay of from $2,000 per year for officers with less than 10 years of service to $5,000 a year for such officers with 18 or more years of service.

While at present there appear to be less than 10 officers on active duty who would qualify for this special pay, at an estimated total cost of $39,000 in fiscal year 1987, the committee intends that this pay be viewed as an indication of its support for the greater utilization of well qualified psychologists by the armed forces and that more well qualified psychologists be recruited and retained to perform many of the functions now being performed by psychiatrists in the military medical services.

Part D—Miscellaneous Benefits

IMPROVED DEATH GRATUITY

The death gratuity, originally instituted in 1908, is designed to provide immediate funds to the family of deceased military members to meet immediate expenses. The rates of the death gratuity have not changed since 1956. Under present law, this payment is equal to six month's basic pay (plus any special and incentive pays) with a minimum of $800 and a maximum of $3,000. Because of increases in pay rates since 1956, the death gratuity for all personnel is $3,000.

The President's Fifth Quadrennial Review on Military Compensation recommended that the death gratuity be updated to better meet the needs of survivors of military personnel. The committee agrees that this benefit should be updated and has included a provision which would provide that the death gratuity will be three months basic pay, basic allowance for subsistence, and basic allowance for quarters with a minimum payment of $3,000 and a maximum of $9,000.

The Department of Defense has recommended that if the death gratuity is improved as the committee provision would do so, that section 403(l) of title 37, United States Code, as added by Public Law 99-227, in response to the tragic aircraft disaster in December, 1985 in Newfoundland, be repealed. That section of law extends to survivors of deceased members an entitlement to remain in government quarters for up to 90 days or continue to receive payable quarters allowance and variable housing allowance for up to 90 days. The committee concurs with this request.

BEST COPY A

AUTHORITY TO PAY BANK CHARGES IN THE EVENT OF GOVERNMENT ERROR IN MANDATORY DIRECT DEPOSIT OF PAY SITUATIONS

Section 3332 of title 31, United States Code, sanctions the direct deposit into financial institutions of payments due to individuals from the United States, including pay and allowances due military personnel. There is no authority for the government to reimburse members for overdraft charges levied against members even if those charges result from error on the part of the government in depositing the member's pay late or in an incorrect manner.

While participation in such direct deposit programs is generally voluntary, various military personnel are now being required to participate in such programs because it is believed such arrangements contribute to readiness for immediate deployment. In cases of mandatory participation, the committee believes there should be authority to reimburse members for charges levied against them as a result of government error, and has included such a provision in the bill.

TRANSPORTATION AND MEDICAL CARE FOR DEPENDENTS OF CERTAIN SENTENCED, DISCHARGED, AND DISMISSED MEMBERS

It has been brought to the attention of the committee that, under present law, dependents of military personnel administratively discharged under other than honorable conditions or sentenced by court-martial to be confined or to be punitively discharged are being unnecessarily penalized because of the member's misconduct. This is of special concern in those cases where the misconduct involves abuse of one or more of the dependents of the member.

As a result, the committee has included a provision amending current law to give the secretaries of the military departments discretionary authority to provide a permanent change of station separation move to dependents of military members who receive an other than honorable discharge, and to provide medical care in a military medical facility or under CHAMPUS for dependents of a military member convicted of dependent abuse for up to 1 year after the member's discharge from the service.

Under current law (10 U.S.C. 404, 406), a military member who is discharged from the service under other than honorable conditions is provided a permanent change of station separation move for himself and his dependents "only by transportation in kind by the least expensive mode of transportation available or by a monetary allowance that does not exceed the cost to the government of such transportation in kind."

The effect of this provision is to deny dependents of military members separated from the service under other than honorable conditions any ability to move their household goods at government expense as part of a separation move.

The effect of this provision, however, has been limited to military members serving in the continental United States. Section 406 (h) of title 10 currently gives the service secretaries discretionary authority to provide a full permanent change of station move to return military members and their families from overseas areas "if the secretary concerned determines it to be in the best interests of the member or his dependents and the United States." In practice, the service secretaries have been using this discretionary authority to provide a full permanent change of station separation move to most military members, their dependents and their household goods who are discharged overseas under other than honorable conditions.

This provision would provide the same discretionary authority for the service secretaries to provide a full permanent change of station separation move for a military member with dependents who is separated under other than honorable conditions in the United States that currently exists in overseas areas. Under this authority, the service secretary could authorize a full permanent change of station separation move for a military member with dependents who is discharged from the service for other than honorable conditions if he determined such a move to be in the best interests of the member, his dependents, or the United States. The sole purpose of this discretionary authority is to allow the service secretaries to mitigate the hardship on the family members in the case of a military member who is discharged under other than honorable conditions.

The provision recommended by the committee contains one change to current practice in this area. Currently, military members are authorized a permanent change of station separation move no longer than the move necessary to go from their final duty station to their home of record. The provision recommended by the committee provides the service secretary discretionary authority to provide a permanent change of station move to an "appropriate location" which in some instances could be beyond the home of record.

The purpose of this change is to give the service secretaries discretionary authority to provide military dependents who may have been the victims of dependent abuse a permanent change of station separation move to a supportive environment that may be beyond the military member's home of record. In providing this authority, the committee expects the Defense Department to use their rulemaking authority to provide transportation beyond the home of record only when absolutely necessary and only in cases of dependent abuse. The Manpower and Personnel Subcommittee will carefully monitor the implementation of this provision to ensure that the military services comply with the intent of this legislation.

This provision of the committee bill also gives the service secretary discretionary authority to provide medical care in a military medical facility or under CHAMPUS, upon request, to the abused dependents of a military member who receives a dishonorable or bad-conduct charge or who is dismissed from the service as a result of a court-martial conviction for an offense involving abuse of a dependent of the member.

Under current law, the dependents of a military member discharged from the service for spouse abuse or child abuse lose all eligibility for medical care in a military medical facility or under CHAMPUS when the member leaves the service. In essence, because they lose all benefits through no fault of their own, these dependents are victimized a second time. They may be left with no apparent means of support, and are also denied basic, necessary medical care that may be required as a result of injury inflicted by the former service member.

This provision would allow victims of dependent abuse, upon request, to continue to receive medical care at government expense for up to 1 year following the military member's discharge. This care would be provided under the same priority system and on the same space available basis as if the member were still in the service.

IMPROVED EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR MILITARY SPOUSES

The Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (Public Law 99–145) included a provision (Section 806) that would provide employment preference in hiring for Department of Defense jobs to spouses of active duty service members for positions above grade GS–7 (or equivalent) if the spouse is among those determined to be best qualified for the position and if the position is located in the same geographic area as the permanent change of station of the member. This section directed the Secretary of Defense to issue regulations to ensure that spouses are advised of any vacancy announcements and are considered for any vacant position within the Defense Department in the same geographic area as the member's permanent duty station.

In addition, Section 806 authorized the President to except from competitive service positions in the Department of Defense located outside the United States in order to provide employment opportunities for qualified military spouses and to provide preference in hiring to qualified spouses for positions in wage grade UA–8 and below (or the equivalent).

The committee bill includes a provision amending Section 806 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986, lowering to grades GS–5 and above (or equivalent) the level at which spouses of military members would be given employment preference hiring for Department of Defense jobs if the spouse is among those determined to be best qualified for the position and if the position is located in the same geographic area as the permanent duty station of the member.

RETIREMENT CREDIT FOR CERTAIN FORMER NATIONAL GUARD TECHNICIANS

The National Guard Technician Act of 1968 provided retroactive credit for purposes of determining eligibility for federal retirement benefits to National Guard civilian technicians for their service up to that time. However, this retroactive credit for retirement purposes was granted only to those National Guard civilian technicians serving in a civilian technician position on or after January 1, 1969. Those National Guard civilian technicians who left their technician positions prior to that date and subsequently became employed by other federal agencies were denied retirement credit for their previous technician service.

The committee recommends a provision that would provide federal retirement credit for National Guard civilian technicians who served as technicians prior to January 1, 1969, regardless of whether or not they were serving in a technician position on or after

January 1, 1969. This provision will allow all individuals with service as a National Guard civilian technician to credit their technician service toward federal retirement provided they meet the other eligibility requirements of the National Guard Technicians Act as amended, including the requirement that they contribute to the civil service retirement system for their years of service as a civilian technician.

The retirement credit provided by the committee provision is prospective only, and shall apply to monthly retirement payments accruing after the date of enactment of this provision. Furthermore, the provisions would apply only to persons who did or will separate from Federal government service on or after January 1, 1969.

DEATH AND DISABILITY BENEFITS FOR RESERVE COMPONENT MEMBERS

In recent years, there have been a number of piecemeal changes made to various statutes relating to pay and medical care for members of the reserve components who become ill, diseased, or disabled or who die as a result of military service.

The Department of Defense has requested a revision of the manner in which members of the reserve components are paid during periods of disability that occur as a consequence of military training and a reform of the various sections of law relating to medical care for such disabilities and pay during periods of disabilities. The Department also requested authority to order to active duty reserve personnel participating in medical screening programs who are diagnosed as having a disqualifying medical defect that might be removed by military medical treatment.

After reviewing the proposals of the Department of Defense, the committee recommends that the revision and reform proposal be adopted, but does not agree with the proposal for medical treatment of disqualifying medical conditions of reserve personnel. The committee disagrees with the latter proposal primarily because of its concern about whether the taxpayers should be asked to pay for medical conditions which do not result from military service, especially if there is no showing that the expense assumed by the government for treatment of such a condition would be offset by other governmental savings. If the Department wishes to pursue this proposal, it should develop an economic analysis of the program to determine if it is cost-effective.

With respect to the proposal adopted by the committee, the following explanation is offered. The Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1985, in section 631, revised the authorization for medical and dental care for members of the reserve components who become ill or diseased during periods of inactive duty training (paid drills for reservists or National Guardsmen scheduled in advance and normally referred to as periodic weekend duty) to include medical care for injuries that might come about traveling to or from such duty. The authority to provide medical care for injuries occurring while traveling to and from such weekend duty was included by the addition of a new section 1074a to title 10 in the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1984. The Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1985 further revised section 1074a to authorize medical care for reservists or National Guardsmen who aggravate pre-existing diseases by performing inactive duty training (known as the heart-attack provision). The latest revision to section 1074a incorporated in that one general section the various provisions throughout titles 10 and 32 that authorize medical and dental care for members of the National Guard and the reserve components (that include the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard reserve forces as defined in section 261 of title 10) into one general provision. It did not include provisions for medical care for persons who are injured while performing the specified reserve duty and did not repeal redundant provisions in other sections of the United States Code authorizing medical care for disability because of disease or illness. The committee provision does just that by amending section 1074a to include the hospitalization coverage for injuries and by repealing redundant (and possibly confusing) provisions in other sections of the United States Code. The revision makes authorized medical and dental care uniform for all members of the National Guard and the several reserve components and clarifies such authorizations.

A second part of the committee provision changes the manner in which members of the reserve components and the National Guard are entitled to military pay and allowances while disabled as a result of reserve duty. Currently, if a member of a reserve component or a National Guardsman is on active duty for 30 days or less and suffers an injury or disease, the authority for continued military pay and allowances is determined by the ability of the Reservist or Guardsman to perform his normal military duties (37 U.S.C. 204). It is possible that a disabled Reservist or Guardsman could perform his civilian job but not his military job and be paid for both during the period of the disability (that has no statutory termination date). Should the person be disabled permanently, chapter 61 of title 10 provides authority for disability retirement or separation. On the other hand, should the same person be able to perform his military duty but not his civilian job, there is no authority to provide any compensation. Since the military duty is only part time, the financial consequence could be substantially detrimental. The instant proposal would correct this inequity by authorizing pay and allowances, limited to a six month period, to such a disabled Reservist or Guardsmen who is unable to earn income from civilian sources as a consequence of the disability. The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Transportation would promulgate regulations to administer the entitlement. If the member could perform in his civilian job but could not perform his military duty, he could be paid for scheduled inactive duty training notwithstanding his ability to train. Current provisions entitling members of the reserve components and the National Guard to full pay and allowances irrespective of their ability to earn civilian compensation would be repealed.

The committee provision revises several provisions regarding disability and death benefits for reservists and members of the National Guard, or their survivors, who die or are disabled while on inactive duty, active duty for 30 days or less, or traveling directly to or from that duty as a consequence of an injury, disease, or illness incurred or aggravated during the period. The revisions make all benefit systems in title 10 uniform insofar as the qualifying factor involves a reservist or Guardsman who dies or is disabled during military, naval, or air duty. The use of the word "directly" in the language of the provision is not intended to change current law that provides various benefits for reserve and National Guard personnel who are injured on their way to and from duty. The language is only conforming.

AUTHORIZATION FOR MEMBERS OF THE SELECTED RESERVE TO HAVE LIMITED USE OF COMMISSARY STORES

The fiscal year 1984 Defense Authorization Act included a provision directing the Department of Defense to conduct a test program in 1 or more areas of the United States in which Selected Reservists could be allowed at their convenience, up to 14 commissary visits each year. Selected Reservists would earn 1 commissary visit for every day of active duty training performed during the year. Reservists would then be eligible to use commissaries in the same manner in which they now use base exchanges. Prior to initiation of this test program, reservists were eligible to shop at commissary stores only when they were on active duty for training.

The committee believes that the successful experience of the test program over the past year warrants expansion of this benefit to Selected Reserve members nationwide. Accordingly, the committee recommends a provision which authorizes members of the Selected Reserve components to use commissary stores a number of days each year equal to the number of days the member performs active duty for training as a member of the Selected Reserve.

PART E—ADMINISTRATION OF PERSONNEL BENEFITS

ACCOUNTING FOR PAYMENTS OF CLAIMS FOR BENEFITS

Section 1552(c) of title 10, United States Code, provides that military departments may pay claims for loss of pay, allowances, compensation, emoluments, or other pecuniary benefits, or for the repayment of a fine or forfeiture if as a result of a board for correction of military record determination, the amount is found due the claimant. However, such claims may only be paid from applicable current appropriations.

It has been suggested to the committee that when appropriations remain available from previous fiscal years when the benefits would have been payable had the error in the member's records not occurred, paying the claim from those appropriations would more accurately reflect proper charges against those appropriations. Therefore, the committee has included a provision which will permit this to occur.

ENHANCED METHOD FOR DETERMINING TRUE COSTS OF MILITARY RETIREMENT

Since fiscal year 1985, military retirement has been funded on an accrual basis. Prior to fiscal year 1985, a single line in the defense budget reflected the projected annual costs of retired pay. Military retirees were paid directly from Department of Defense appropriations. Section 925 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1984 (Public Law 98-94) established a Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund in order to finance on an actuarially sound basis liabilities of the Department of Defense under military retirement and survivor benefit programs. The law established a fund on the books of the Treasury which receives monthly payments from the Department of Defense and yearly amortized payments from the Treasury on the unfunded liabilities. Payments to retired members are now made from the fund.

The Department of Defense payments are equal to the normal cost percentage times the total amount of basic pay paid each month for members on active duty or in the Selected Reserve. The normal cost is a single level percentage of basic pay derived using the aggregate entry-age normal cost method. The percentage is determined in actuarial valuations using assumptions approved by the Department of Defense Retirement Board of Actuaries, also established under the new law.

Under the procedures in effect since fiscal year 1985, payments into the fund are budgeted in the military and reserve personnel accounts of each service. Thus, under the accrual accounting method for funding military retirement and survivor benefits, the costs of military retirement must be taken into account in the formulation of service budgets.

A problem has become apparent, however, with the requirement of the law that there be a single level percentage determined for all active duty and Selected Reserve members using the aggregate entry-age normal cost method. Active and reserve retirement systems are projected together to develop an appropriate "uniform" contribution. The result is that the contribution—the percentage of basic pay or normal cost percentage—for part-time and full-time members is the same. If this normal cost percentage were calculated separately, it would be much lower for part-time personnel and slightly higher for full-time members.

One practical effect of the single contribution percentage in current law is that the budgeted costs for reserve personnel are significantly greater than if a separate normal cost were developed for part-time and full-time military members. This makes the accurate comparison of the relative costs of active and reserve forces unnecessarily complex and overstates the cost of reserve personnel in Department of Defense budgets.

The single contribution percentage also results in a larger Department of Defense payment into the fund than would be required if a separate normal cost were determined for part-time and full-time members. Using current assumptions, the use of separate contribution percentages for full-time and part-time members would likely reduce the annual Department of Defense payment by some $500,000,000.

The retirement and survivor benefit systems for active duty and part-time reserve service are distinctly different. Members who retire after twenty or more years of active duty receive an immediate retirement annuity and they and their dependents are eligible for medical care, commissary and exchange privileges, etc. Members transferred to the Retired Reserve after completion of twenty or more qualifying years of service for a reserve retirement (retired pay for non-regular service under chapter 67 of title 10) receive no retirement pay until they are at least 60 years of age, nor are they eligible for medical care, commissary and exchange privileges, etc., until that time. The survivor benefits for reservists who are or would have been eligible for retirement under chapter 67 are also distinctly different than for active members.

The amendments to chapter 74 of title 10, contained in the bill, would require that separate determinations, both using the aggregate entry-age normal cost method, would be made for (1) members on active duty (to include members of the reserve components on active duty or full-time National Guard duty who are serving in other than a training status) and (2) members of the Ready Reserve who serve in a part-time status or in a full-time status for training only. The separate normal cost percentages developed for full-time members of the armed forces and for Ready Reservists would be used as a multiplier against the actual or projected basic pay and drill pay (the latter as authorized under section 206 of title 37, United States Code) to determine the amounts to be budgeted by the Secretary of Defense for contributions to the fund under section 1465(b) and paid by the Secretary of Defense into the fund at the end of each month under section 1466(a) of title 10, United States Code.

The committee provision will result in a more accurate portrayal of the cost of retirement and survivor benefit programs for the reserve components in the Department of Defense budget process. Department of Defense payments into the fund will also more accurately reflect the normal costs for all military retirement and survivor benefit plan programs.

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE

ALTERNATIVE HEALTH CARE PLANS

In two hearings conducted by the Manpower and Personnel Subcommittee, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs described in some detail the planning now underway to offer to military medical care beneficiaries an alternative to CHAMPUS in obtaining care not available in military medical facilities. This project, called project IMPRINT, is designed to correct a number of deficiencies in the present military medical system which have been the subject of a series of hearings by the Manpower and Personnel Subcommittee. Among these problems is the slow but steady shift in emphasis in the military medical system from its primary mission of wartime medical care toward becoming a peacetime birth-to-death medical care system for more than 10 million beneficiaries, only some 25% of which are active duty military personnel. One cause of this problem has been the promises made over the years to military members by recruiters, career counselors, and others that military retirees are guaranteed medical care in military treatment facilities after retirement. Retirees have never been entitled to such care, but rather are entitled to be provided the care if the facilities and staff are adequate to provide the requested care. Nonetheless, the expectations created by generalized promises made to military personnel while serving on active duty have resulted in unprecedented demands from this portion of the military medical beneficiary population for care in military facilities.

Added to this demand is that created by the increasing size of the active duty forces and the demographic changes in those forces, primarily many more married active duty personnel with families also seeking care in military facilities.

With these increasing demands on military medical facilities and staff, it is easy to understand how emphasis could shift from wartime care to peacetime care.

At the same time, CHAMPUS, designed to provide care to military beneficiaries when the care is not available in military facilities, has faced similar increases in demand. Unfortunately, the present method of obtaining care under CHAMPUS, virtually uncontrolled for outpatient care and with only limited control through use of nonavailability certificates for inpatient care, does not permit the government to utilize many of the recent innovations in the provision of health care, such as preferred provider or health maintenance organizations. At the same time, the level of dissatisfaction among beneficiaries who utilize CHAMPUS is high.

In short, the committee has little doubt that the present military medical system is not working well. At the same time, the committee does not believe this is the fault of the men and women who labor in that system. Rather, the system merely was not planned, designed, or constructed to provide efficiently the care now required by the military beneficiary population.

For these reasons, the committee is fully supportive of the efforts by the Department of Defense to bring about a restructuring of the military medical system. In hearings before the Manpower and Personnel Subcommittee, Departmental witnesses have described a concept in which military medical facilities and military health care personnel will be once again focused on the primary mission of the system —wartime care and preparation for that care. Additionally, an alternative civilian care system has been described in which regional at-risk contractors will contract with the Department to provide the health care needs of a portion of military beneficiaries, who elect to participate in this program, when those needs cannot or should not be provided in military medical facilities. Those same witnesses have testified that they believe such an alternative could result in equal or better health care for military beneficiaries at a cost not exceeding the present CHAMPUS system.

In order to accomplish this restructuring of the military medical system, two changes in statute have been identified as necessary. The first of these changes would permit the Secretary of Defense to waive the co-payment requirements for any contract for health care and to waive the limitation on types of health care which may be provided under contract plans. The second change is to permit the sharing of staff, equipment, and resources between civilian and military health care provision systems.

The committee recommends provisions which would accomplish both of these changes. The sharing of medical resources would be permitted in those cases where such sharing will result in more efficient, effective, or economical health care than if the sharing did not occur.

The committee's provisions also provide authority for the waiver of co-payment and limitations in types of care that apply to CHAMPUS. However, such authority could be exercised only during periods for which the Secretary of Defense has certified in writing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives that a health care plan to which such a waiver applies will (1) provide substantially the same care at less cost to the government; or (2) provide better care at no additional cost to the government, than does CHAMPUS. Such a certification would have to be transmitted to the committees 180 days before the waiver authority could be exercised.

While the committee has approved provisions which would permit the Department of Defense to go forward with its plans to implement an alternative health care program under Project IMPRINT, the committee has several continuing concerns as follows:

(1) That no alternative program reduce in any substantial way the level or quality of care now provided to the present military beneficiary population.

(2) That an alternative plan be clear and understandable to military beneficiaries.

(3) That freedom of choice for beneficiaries be preserved through only voluntary enrollment in such a program, at least during early implementation.

(4) That industry concerns about adverse selection, inability to adequately define a beneficiary population, and about full and open competition be considered.

The Department should work closely with the committee to ensure that these concerns and concerns of all parties interested in military health care are adequately addressed before any final decisions are made on an alternative health care system.

CONFIDENTIALITY OF MEDICAL QUALITY ASSURANCE RECORDS

Medical quality assurance programs are the primary mechanism by which the Military Departments monitor and ensure that quality medical care is provided to Department of Defense beneficiaries. These programs involve a continuous review of the delivery of health care services within all military medical treatment facilities.

Central to these quality assurance review activities is the peer review process. This is the process by which the performance of individual physicians as well as other health care providers is reviewed by credentials committees, surgical review committees, and other medical care review activities conducted by their peers. To be effective, this type of collegial review process must operate in an environment of confidentiality in order to elicit candid appraisals and evaluations of fellow professionals.

Lacking the protection of confidentiality, members of military medical care review committees have become increasingly reluctant to make candid appraisals of their peers. Fearing release of committee records under the Freedom of Information Act or through discovery in litigation, medical professionals who are in the best position to judge quality and ensure adherence to quality-of-care standards are constrained from properly exercising their quality assurance mandate. As an indirect result, beneficiaries may receive less than the high quality care they deserve.

This problem is not unique to the Military Health Care system. The Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals, the nationally recognized hospital accrediting body, recommends legislation to protect quality assurance records from unwarranted disclosure. The civilian medical community enjoys such protection since all states have confidentiality laws preventing disclosure of these records in litigation.

The medical quality assurance records of the Department of Defense medical treatment facilities do not share this same protection from discovery. In addition, unlike private institutions, Defense medical facilities are subject to the Freedom of Information Act.

The committee, therefore, has included a provision designed to protect military medical quality assurance records from release under the Freedom of Information Act and in litigation. It would trigger the third exemption of the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. 552(b)(3), by prohibiting release except in narrowly defined circumstances. The provision would also bar the discovery or use of such records in litigation. This would allow the effective operation of medical quality assurance programs in the health care facilities of the Department of Defense.

While the provision largely follows the existing Veterans Administration statute, it differs in several respects. For example, the provision confers "good faith" civil immunity on persons who are involved in medical quality assurance activities, in order to encourage the candid assessment of Defense health care systems and providers. The provision would not provide "transactional" immunity for matters appearing in medical quality assurance records. Data from records created and information maintained outside a medical quality assurance program, such as the patient's medical records, would not be immune from discovery or use merely because they were presented during committee meetings. Only testimony about the proceeding of peer review would be prohibited, but not testimony concerning underlying facts that are otherwise discoverable or releasable under the Freedom of Information Act.

The provision also would allow disclosure of quality assurance records to departmental auditors, investigators, and internal inspectors who have a need for such records or testimony to perform official duties.

The committee places a high priority on ensuring that the best quality of medical care is provided to Department of Defense beneficiaries, within available resources. That goal can be reached only by having fully functioning and highly efficient quality assurance programs within each military medical department. The mainstays of these programs are candid peer reviews of military and civilian health care providers within each military medical and dental treatment facility. The committee provision is designed to encourage that type of candid peer review and quality assurance.

REGISTRATION OF HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONALS

In a number of hearings conducted by the Manpower and Personnel Subcommittee over the past two years, it has become increasingly evident that in the event of full mobilization it would become necessary to begin seeking additional health care personnel from civilian life to augment the active and reserve forces. There have been a number of suggestions that such additional necessary personnel could be quickly transitioned into military service only if a peacetime registration of such personnel is conducted. The committee is aware that a bill has been introduced in the House of Representatives which would establish such a peacetime registration requirement for health care providers.

Following suggestions by the Chairman and other Members of the Manpower and Personnel Subcommittee that such a bill might be introduced in the Senate, a number of health provider organizations have contacted the committee and urged that such a requirement not be imposed and suggested that information needed by the Department of Defense to plan for a full mobilization contingency can be obtained through voluntary cooperation between the Department of Defense and such organizations.

The committee is encouraged by these offers of voluntary cooperation and believes if such cooperation can provide the information required by the Department of Defense for mobilization planning and for use in the event of mobilization, this approach is preferable to mandatory registration.

The committee will closely monitor the voluntary development of information relating to the names, addresses, and qualifications of health care providers in the general population. It will not be enough, however, for groups of health care providers to indicate that since such groups of providers were willing to enter the military in past wars, that no additional planning or information is required. The committee believes it would be inappropriate to plan for the last war, especially in the critically important health care field. If voluntary cooperation proves to be inadequate, the committee will consider again the need for a health provider registration.

DENTAL INSURANCE PROGRAM

As part of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986, a dental insurance program for dependents of active duty personnel was authorized. That program was to provide, on a voluntary enrollment basis, 100 percent coverage for preventive, diagnostic, and emergency services and 80 percent coverage for composite and amalgam fillings and dental appliance repairs. Additionally, the program was to be structured so that the cost of premiums did not exceed $10 per month per family and so that the government did not pay more than 60 percent of the total program costs. The Defense Department estimated that the government's share of the cost of this program would be $105 million dollars for full year implementation in fiscal year 1986.

However, because this committee was concerned about the Department's ability to structure a dental insurance program under the above guidelines, the program was delayed until September 30, 1986.

While the Department has continued to assert that such a benefit program could be provided, it has been inexcusably slow in providing validated analyses of its proposed program. Additionally, Department witnesses have testified that they are experiencing difficulty in obtaining interest from the dental insurance industry to underwrite such a program because the Congress failed to appropriate any funds during fiscal year 1986 for this purpose. As a result, the committee has been advised that even if funds are appropriated during fiscal year 1987, the program cannot be implemented until August 1987.

The committee supports a dental insurance program under the guidelines surrounding the authorization of that program. In order to overcome the reported reluctance of industry to become involved in this program, the committee has included a provision specifically authorizing $18,000,000 (the amount the Department believes it can spend in fiscal year 1987) for this program, under the previously described guidelines.

The Department is directed to immediately begin implementation of this program so that no further delay will occur in this important health care benefit.

DENTAL CARE FOR DEPENDENTS ON ACCOMPANIED TOURS OVERSEAS

Dependents of members of the uniformed services (family members) at overseas duty stations are currently entitled to dental care at an uniformed services treatment facility only on a space available basis. It is frequently the case that there is no space available for dental treatment for family members in such facilities and also that the dental services available in the private sector are inadequate. There are very few U.S.-trained equivalent dental practitioners in many areas outside the United States. Family members are then forced to delay treatment until they return to the United States or until an emergency develops.

To correct this problem, the uniformed services are directed to evaluate the availability of space for the dental treatment of family members on accompanied tours in overseas military treatment facilities and also to evaluate the availability of qualified and adequately trained dental practitioners in the private sector of those communities overseas where family members on accompanied tours are stationed. The Secretary of Defense should report on the results of this evaluation, with any recommendations for further action, to the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services no later than February 1, 1987.

In the interim, in those cases where there appears to be inadequate space available for providing dental treatment overseas for family members on accompanied tours in uniformed services treatment facilities and where there appear to be inadequate qualified dental practitioners available in the private sector, the uniformed services are urged to increase the staff and resources of the uniformed services treatment facility to provide for adequate dental care to qualified family members.

VIETNAM POW HEALTH FOLLOW-UP STUDIES

The committee understands that, at the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, the clinical Studies Division, Special Studies Department, Naval Aerospace Medical Institute at Pensacola, Florida, continues to provide follow-up study and care for Naval personnel who were prisoners of war in Vietnam. The study appears highly useful for determining the long-term health consequences of the POW experience and for identifying particular classes of problems affecting POWs from all the services. The committee commends the Navy for its initiative, and expresses its opinion that the Navy should continue to make adequate resources available for the conduct of the follow-up study and for the dissemination of results to all officials concerned about appropriate care and treatment of prisoners of war in Vietnam.

TITLE VIII—MILITARY JUSTICE

At the request of the Department of Defense, the committee has approved and included in the bill several provisions relating to procedures under the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) (Chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code).

The first of these provisions would establish in law an insanity defense and procedures for resolving that defense in trials by court-martial. In 1984, Congress established new standards relating to insanity under the Federal Criminal Code. Whether those Federal criminal code standards apply to trials by court-martial is unclear. The committee provision will resolve that ambiguity by setting forth those standards within the UCMJ. Under this standard, an accused has the burden of proving by clear and convincing evidence that at the time of the commission of the acts constituting the offense, the accused, as a result of a severe mental disease or defect, was unable to appreciate the nature and quality or wrongfulness of the acts. Under the committee provision, these new statutory standards will apply only to offenses committed on or after the date of enactment. Current practice will apply to earlier offenses.

The second committee provision makes a minor change to Article 43 of the UCMJ (10 U.S.C. 843) by specifically permitting requests by an enlisted accused that enlisted members be appointed to a court-martial to be made orally on the record or in writing, which is the only way such requests can be made under present law. This change would apply only in trials by court-martial in which arraignment has not been completed prior to the effective date.

The third committee provision amends Article 136 of the UCMJ (10 U.S.C. 936) to expand the categories of persons who may administer oaths under that section to include persons who are in inactive-duty training as well as persons on active duty. This change recognizes the increasing utilization of reserve components personnel and would permit those personnel in inactive-duty training to administer oaths for purposes of military administration, including military justice, in performing certain functions presently enumerated in Article 136 or if necessary in the performance of their duties.

The fourth committee provision would reform the statute of limitations provisions now contained in the UCMJ and bring those provisions more in line with federal criminal code provisions (See Chapter 213 of title 18, United States Code). Under the committee provision, no statute of limitation would exist in prosecution of offenses for which the death penalty is a punishment prescribed by or pursuant to the UCMJ or of the offenses of absent without leave in time of war or missing movement in time of war. Prosecution of all other offenses would have a statute of limitations of five years. A person could not be punished under Article 15, UCMJ (10 U.S.C.

815) for any offense committed more than two years before the imposition of punishment. However, a person upon whom such punishment is proposed may elect to waive this limitation. The running of the statute of limitations would be tolled during any period when an accused is absent without authority or fleeing from justice.

The committee provision also incorporates federal civilian practice by permitting reinstitution of charges within six months after their dismissal as defective or insufficient, even if the statute of limitations has expired at the time of dismissal or will expire during the six month period following dismissal. While this provision offers the government an opportunity to perfect otherwise defective charges within a reasonable period after their dismissal for legal defect, it in no way relieves the government of any constitutional, statutory, or regulatory requirement to provide an accused a speedy trial.

The fifth committee provision would streamline the current law regarding the submission of matters by an accused to the convening authority after trial. Under the committee provision, an accused, except in a summary court-martial, would have 10 days from service of the record of trial or service of the staff judge advocate's recommendations, whichever is later, to submit matters to the convening authority. In a summary court-martial, matters could be submitted within seven days following announcement of the sentence. Both of these periods could be extended by the convening authority for up to an additional 20 days upon the request of the accused for good cause.

The sixth committee provision will clarify the authority of judge advocates who are assigned or detailed to perform the functions of a civil office in the Government of the United States under section 973(b)(2)(B) of title 10, United States Code, to represent the United States in civil or criminal cases. While this authority was intended when section 973 of title 10 was recently amended, questions have been raised as to whether that section permits representation of the United States by judge advocates in criminal and civil cases. This committee provision makes that intent explicitly clear.

MILITARY CONFINEMENT SYSTEM

In its report accompanying S. 2723, the Omnibus Defense Authorization Act, 1985 (Senate Report 98-500), the committee expressed its concern that there was an insufficient connection between the processes under the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) (10 U.S.C. 801-940) through which a member may be sentenced to confinement and the subsequent processes under which that member may be required to serve that sentence, which are controlled primarily by chapter 48 of title 10, United States Code (10 U.S.C. 951-956).

In that same report, the committee raised questions about apparent disparities in the opportunity for restoration to duty or for parole which exists between the Services and even between various confinement facilities.

The committee continues to have these concerns and has received numerous complaints from military members who are con-

BEST COPY

fined within the military confinement system concerning the lack of sufficient numbers of on-sight defense counsel to assist them in pursuing post-trial relief and concerning the lack of clear, objective, and uniform standards being utilized in parole and restoration decisions. Additionally, the committee has noted an increase in the number of complaints being received by the committee from parents and other family members of military confinees expressing dismay and disillusionment with the military confinement system.

In this regard, the committee notes that there is presently only one military defense counsel assigned to the United States Disciplinary Barracks (USDB), where approximately 1343 military personnel are confined. While many of the military personnel at the USDB are being represented by appointed military appellate defense counsel on matters properly reviewable by appellate courts under the UCMJ, these appellate counsel are physically located in the Washington, D.C. area, several hundred miles from the USDB, and personal contact between the military prisoner and his appellate counsel is very limited. Furthermore, since military appellate courts, at present, exercise virtually no jurisdiction over military confinement facilities, or over the parole or restoration systems of the Services, appellate military counsel have little, if any, opportunity to assist their clients in such matters.

Furthermore, statistics of the Department of Defense reveal that in recent years, the opportunity for a military member sentenced to be discharged by a court-martial to be restored to duty has become extremely limited. The Armed Services justify this result on the grounds that it is now a more efficient manpower policy to recruit and train new personnel than to retrain and restore to duty those who have been convicted by a court-martial. While such a policy may be more efficient under the present recruiting atmosphere, it has not always been the case and it may not remain the case in the future. Furthermore, a secondary, although perhaps unintended, effect of such a policy is that an "appropriate" sentence outcome for a given criminal offense becomes dependent, not on the nature of the offense or rehabilitation of the offender, but rather on the recruiting successes being enjoyed by a particular Service at the time. Simply stated, two offenders convicted of and sentenced to be discharged for identical crimes and who have identical military service and confinement records may suffer substantially different sentence outcomes (one discharged with a bad conduct or dishonorable discharge and the other returned to duty with the possibility of honorable discharge) only because the recruiting and retention experienced at the time of one's confinement differs from that at the time of the other's confinement or because the recruiting and retention atmosphere in the Service of one offender differs from that in the Service of the other offender.

In short, while one of the principal objectives of the Uniform Code of Military Justice is to provide uniform administration of military justice to all the Armed Forces, there still remains little uniformity in the end stage of the military justice process—the confinement, restoration, and parole systems.

The Navy has recently announced that it plans to institute a new restoration program under which it hopes, by 1991, to retrain and restore to duty some 1,140 convicted military personnel per year. The Navy is to be commended for this program that should give Navy personnel a greater opportunity to overcome previous mistakes and to earn other than a punitive discharge. However, the Navy is at the same time seeking, as part of its military construction request, the authority to construct three new consolidated confinement facilities along with a number of port side brigs. While there appears to be good justification for these short-term (under 30 days) brigs, the committee is concerned about the construction of additional Service-specific consolidated confinement facilities, when there appear to be suitable facilities available which are not presently in use. For example, the Army presently owns medium sized facilities at Fort Dix, New Jersey, and at Fort Ord, California. The Fort Dix facility is presently being utilized by the State of New Jersey, but may be returned to military use on fairly short notice. The Fort Ord facility is presently underutilized and could be used to fill the Navy's needs on the West Coast.

Additionally, joint service use or at least joint service management of these two existing facilities would, in addition to saving military construction funding, present the opportunity for the Services to continue to develop joint confinement programs, such as the one now being operated by the Army and Air Force at Fort Lewis, Washington. In addition, the use of these existing facilities by the Navy in the early stages of its newly announced retraining program will give the Congress the opportunity to review the rehabilitation and restoral rates from that program to determine if the program justifies the construction of single service facilities, which may be necessary for retraining and restoration programs, or whether joint use, joint operated facilities designed primarily for rehabilitation of offenders for return to civilian life are needed.

TITLE IX—DEFENSE ACQUISITION REORGANIZATION AND IMPROVEMENTS ACT

The Senate Armed Services Subcommittee on Defense Acquisition Policy conducted a series of oversight hearings in the fall of 1985 on the implementation of the acquisition reforms passed by Congress in 1984 (S. Hrg. 99-508). The hearings were held in response to criticisms that Congressionally-mandated reforms had resulted in reduced flexibility and a significant increase in procurement administrative leadtimes. During the course of the four hearings, the subcommittee received testimony from officials of the Department of Defense, the Joint Logistics Commanders, industry associations and other outside witnesses.

Because of the short period between the implementation of much of the legislation and the time of the subcommittee hearings, the witnesses could only share preliminary assessments on the impact of the new legislation. The witnesses did raise concerns with the implementation of some of the legislation, but it was generally concluded that, with one exception, no major changes to current acquisition law are advisable at this time. In addition, most of the witnesses argued for Congress to shift the focus of its efforts from the specifics of the contracting process to general policy issues in defense acquisition.

The President's Blue Ribbon Commission on Defense Management, known as the Packard Commission, underscored the latter point in both their *Interim Report* issued on February 28, 1986 and their Report to the President on Defense Acquisition, entitled *A Formula for Action*, issued in April 1986. In addition, the Commission recommended that both the Department of Defense and the Congress work together to improve defense acquisition management by utilizing successful management tools developed by the private sector, such as increased funding stability, clear lines of authority and responsibility, and the use of small high-quality staffs.

The legislation considered by the subcommittee for inclusion in the Defense Acquisition Reorganization and Improvements Act reflects this shift in focus. S. 2082, introduced on February 20, 1986, addresses the broader issues of increasing the professionalism of the acquisition workforce, enhancing the authority and responsibility of the managers of major defense programs, and removing senior Defense Department acquisition officials from conflict-of-interest situations. S. 2151 and S. 2355 propose the establishment of an office of the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition to provide for the full-time oversight and management of acquisition in the Department of Defense. Finally, S. 2196 would amend current law to remove impediments to the acquisition of commercial products, as well as repeal the requirement in section 2406, title 10 U.S.C. that defense contractors maintain certain types of data.

In 1986, the Defense Acquisition Policy Subcommittee held five hearings before full committee consideration of these proposals. The subcommittee received testimony on S. 2082, S. 2151 and S. 2196 on March 13, March 19, and March 27. On April 8, the subcommittee received testimony from the President's Blue Ribbon Commission on Defense Management on the commission's acquisition reform proposals. Finally, on May 20, the subcommittee held a hearing on the role and placement of the Office of Operational Test and Evaluation in recent acquisition reorganization proposals.

UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR ACQUISITION

This section establishes the position of Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition (USD(A)) and provides that he shall be well qualified by education, training and industrial experience to assume the highly complex job of supervising the entire acquisition system of the Department of Defense. The committee finds itself in agreement with the findings and recommendations of the Packard Commission. Many of the more serious deficiencies noted over the past few years can be attributed to the fragmentation of acquisition policy within the Office of the Secretary of Defense. As a result, the Services have often developed individual policies. The new Under Secretary, established at the Executive Level II, is empowered, under the Secretary to:

—supervise the entire Department of Defense acquisition system;

—establish all policies for acquisition, procurement, research and development, logistics, testing, contract audit, and contract administration within the Department of Defense;

—establish defense industrial base policies;

—serve as the acquisition executive for the Department of Defense;

—serve as the senior procurement executive of the Department of Defense; and

—have the authority to direct the Secretaries of the military departments and heads of all other entities of the Department of Defense with regard to matters for which the Under Secretary has responsibility.

The duties and responsibilities set forth are the minimum necessary to accomplish the reforms needed. While the section permits the Secretary of Defense to prescribe the duties and powers of the Under Secretary, the Secretary may only expand the duties and powers of the new Under Secretary; he may not reduce the duties and powers listed.

The section also provides that the Under Secretary will have precedence with regard to all matters for which he has responsibility as set forth in the law and as prescribed by the Secretary of Defense immediately after the Deputy Secretary and before the Secretaries of the military departments. In all other matters, the Under Secretary for Acquisition takes precedence after the Service Secretaries.

It is recognized by the committee that a primary role of the new Under Secretary will be in the formulation of policy for his functional areas of responsibility. He will not have the time or resources to be a super program manager. The committee expects that the execution of individual acquisition programs will be carried out in the Services and other defense components. However, since it is the clear intent that the USD(A) will be held accountable for supervising the entire acquisition system, it is essential that he be empowered to enforce compliance with defense-wide policies. Moreover, in the exceptional case where it may become necessary for the Under Secretary to issue a direction in an individual case, the law makes clear that he has that power. The Under Secretary will normally participate in, or make programmatic decisions at relatively major programmatic decision points. To the extent those decisions may differ with the wishes of a Service Secretary or Service acquisition executive, the bill makes clear that the decisions of the new Under Secretary will prevail in his areas of responsibility.

The section further abolishes the position of Under Secretary of Defense Research and Engineering and re-designates it as the Director of Defense Research and Engineering at Executive Level III. This position remains of extreme importance in the Office of the Secretary of Defense but is one essentially of program advocacy. This is in sharp contrast to the decision-making function of the new Under Secretary. It is the committee's view that the new USD(A) should chair any Joint Requirements and Management Board and not "co-chair" such board as suggested in the Packard Commission Report language. A co-chair role does not convey the full scope of the USD(A)'s decision-making responsibility envisioned by the committee. The USD(A) is not a program advocate but the Secretary of Defense's principal acquisition decision-maker.

The magnitude and complexity of the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition make it clear that a deputy is necessary to assist the new Under Secretary in carrying out his many and varied duties. Therefore, the committee approved the creation of a position for a Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition. The Deputy should also be a person qualified by education, training and experience and should serve in the absence or unavailability of the USD(A). The committee believes that this should occur even though other officials may out-rank him. Finally, the committee believes that the Deputy should not have a background as a "program advocate" which could make it difficult for him to carry out his responsibilities in an independent manner.

In establishing an office with such broad powers and responsibilities, it is important that certain of the checks and balances that have proven so effective over the years not be lost. The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition will establish appropriate overall policy for the administrative oversight of defense contractors. The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition will also establish policy with respect to the need for audit services required in various contracting situations, costs principles applicable to government contracts, and the procedures for obtaining necessary audits to assure that DOD's oversight of contractor performance is effective. The Defense Contract Audit Agency will continue its role as the independent agency responsible for determining the nature and scope of audit necessary to comply with the "Standards For Audit Of Governmental Organizations, Programs, Activities, and Functions" issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and the generally accepted auditing standards established by the American Institute for Certified Public Accountants.

Although the committee has chosen the Packard Commission recommendation to give the Under Secretary responsibility for testing, the committee is absolutely clear that this reorganization does not in any way affect the independence and objectivity demanded of and by the Office of Operational Test and Evaluation. In fact, the Subcommittee on Defense Acquisition Policy devoted one entire hearing to the issue of OT&E and was unanimous in its view that the independence of OT&E will continue to be unaffected by the creation of the USD(A). For that reason the bill makes clear that the reports of the Director of the Office of Operational Test and Evaluation required under subsection (b)(5) of 10 U.S.C. 136a are to be submitted without intervening review and approval to the Secretary and the appropriate committees of the Congress as well as to the new Under Secretary. In the event the Under Secretary wishes to elaborate or comment on a report, he may do so, of course, but he cannot act as a filter, as some observers have feared.

In order to complete the totality of grouping all acquisition-related functions under the USD(A), and also as recommended by the Packard Commission, the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business has been made an additional part of the responsibility of the Under Secretary. Here also the committee sees no diminution of status or loss of independence for that office or function.

DEFENSE ENTERPRISE PROGRAMS

Recent analyses of management practices in private industry have shown that an approach based on the principles of decentralization, clear lines of authority and responsibility, and streamlined procedures have proven consistently successful. In the Packard Commission report entitled *A Formula for Action*, special emphasis was placed on the recommendation that successful lessons from management in the private sector be injected into the Department of Defense acquisition process.

The current framework for acquisition management in the Department of Defense runs counter to the private industry model. The authority and responsibility for the management of specific programs have been diluted by the growth of large bureaucratic oversight and review organizations. The growth of this bureaucracy has resulted in the insertion of unnecessary layers between program managers and the Secretaries of the Services, as well as the proliferation of functional organizations which often make conflicting claims on the management priorities of a defense program.

Concurrent with the growth of this bureaucratic structure has been the increase in the numbers of detailed directives, specifications and regulations, which further limit the program manager's flexibility. Finally, the annual authorization and appropriations process frequently denies the program manager in the Department of Defense the funding stability required for effective long-term planning. As a result, the acquisition cycle for major defense systems averages ten to fifteen years, or about twice the length of time required to develop and manufacture systems of similar complexity in private industry.

The committee recognizes along with the Packard Commission that the current management practices in the Department of Defense have become deeply entrenched over several decades. However, the probability of future defense funding constraints requires that action be taken now to streamline the acquisition process and to reduce the acquisition cycle for defense systems. Rather than attempt to overturn radically this system in a short time, the committee has provided the authority to the Service Secretaries to designate defense programs as enterprise programs in order to introduce improved management practices on a selective basis. Under the enterprise program concept, the authority of the program manager to manage his program with minimum reliance on outside review would be enhanced and programs selected as enterprise programs would be candidates for funding authorizations to cover an entire period between acquisition milestones. It is the intent of the committee that management lessons derived from enterprise programs be applied to the management of all defense programs to the maximum extent practicable.

Section 921 would create a new chapter 132 in title 10 U.S.C. consisting of five sections. Section 2221 includes definitions for the new chapter 132. Section 2222 authorizes the Secretaries of the Military Departments, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, to designate any defense program as a defense enterprise program. Choice of programs was limited to major acquisition systems in the bill as introduced, but the committee concluded that such limitation was not necessary, and that in fact the Secretaries should select non-major programs as well as major systems for the purpose of determining the extent of the concept's applicability. The committee believes that the transition from the current system to that contemplated for defense enterprise programs may not be easy, especially given the new system of milestone authorizations. The Services are encouraged to proceed with a number of pilot projects for immediate designation as enterprise programs. Because the selection of candidate programs is critical to the success of this new approach in defense acquisition, the committee urges care and caution on the part of the Services in designating the first enterprise programs.

The committee believes the following criteria should guide the Services in selecting the initial enterprise programs:

—the projects should incorporate relatively mature technology with moderate program risk;

—the projects should be firmly supported by requirements analysis and represent a consensus solution to meeting those requirements;

—the projects should not initially be multi-billion dollar programs, but more modest programs; and

—the programs should promise significant advances over current capabilities.

Section 2222 further specifies that the defense enterprise program shall be subject to the authority only of the acquisition executive of the Service or the delegate of the acquisition executive. The section further specifies that the enterprise program shall be subject to no other regulation, policy, directive, or administrative rule or guideline other than Federal law, the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) and the Department of Defense Supplement to the Federal Acquisition Regulation (DFARS), unless specified by the acquisition executive of the Service.

The committee believes that, in addition to the FAR and DFARS, only the minimum reporting requirements consistent with statute and executive orders should encumber the enterprise program manager. The committee further intends that the Service acquisition executive should review each additional directive, policy, and other guidelines for an enterprise program on an individual basis before any further administrative requirements are added to the program and that these additional requirements be spelled out in a formal agreement between the Service acquisition executive and the defense enterprise program manager soon after the designation of the enterprise program.

Section 2223 states that a Service Secretary may appoint as an enterprise program manager a member of the Armed Services or a civilian employee of the Service. Each enterprise program manager must have a minimum of eight years experience in the acquisition, support and maintenance of weapon systems. A member of the Armed Services may be appointed an enterprise program manager without regard to grade or administrative policy of the Service. The tenure of an enterprise program manager is established as the lesser of four years or the period beginning on the date of appointment and ending on the date of the next acquisition milestone for the program. Otherwise, a defense enterprise program manager may be removed only for inadequate job performance, misconduct or to head a more important enterprise program.

Section 2223 further prescribes that an enterprise program manager shall receive an annual performance evaluation by his supervisor. The evaluation shall be based on the extent to which the program manager meets the quality, schedule and technical objectives of the program. The committee intends that the enterprise program manager have the authority to accept or reject the proposals of the normal functional and oversight organizations within the Service with respect to his program. In the event of an unresolvable conflict, the committee envisions that the matter would be referred to the Service acquisition executive for final resolution. Section 2223 also provides that such organizations who, but for the designation of the program as an enterprise program, would have supervisory or other authority to approve or disapprove the decisions of the program manager may submit comments to be considered in the preparation of the performance evaluation of the enterprise program manager.

Section 2224 provides the authority for the enterprise program manager to appoint a senior and a technical staff to assist him in managing the program. The role of the technical staff is to enable the enterprise program manager to more effectively manage his program by providing independent advice on matters under the control of other organizations within the Service or the Department of Defense. The committee intends that the enterprise program manager use his technical staff in this advisory role as well as for more effective liaison with other organizations within the Service and the Department of Defense. The committee does not intend that these technical staff substitute for or duplicate the roles and functions of existing organizations within the Service or the Department of Defense.

Section 2224 does not specify the source of individuals comprising an enterprise program technical staff. The committee believes that the Secretary of Defense, in implementing this section, should develop procedures to provide qualified personnel from all the relevant organizations in the Department of Defense and to ensure that sufficient staff are available from the participating Services for those multi-service programs which may be designated as enterprise programs.

Section 2225 establishes a new framework for legislative oversight and authorization of defense acquisition programs. In this section, the committee has provided a process for the Secretary of Defense to submit an authorization request for the funding required to complete an acquisition phase of an enterprise program. Under current practice, Congress evaluates and authorizes funding for annual increments of activity in each defense program. This current process of annual reviews reinforces a tendency to focus on accounting considerations rather than policy issues. It tends also to prolong contentiousness over a program, thus undermining stable program management.

By contrast in the Department of Defense, systems are reviewed in detail by senior decision-makers only at key milestones in the acquisition cycle of the program. If approved to proceed, the Services establish a baseline for the program which is sufficient to support the program until the next acquisition milestone.

The Packard Commission recommended extending this baselining and milestone review process to Congress through a system of milestone authorizations. Under this oversight method, Congress would authorize the Service to proceed with a defense program through the completion of the pending acquisition phase, such as demonstration and validation, full-scale development (including low-rate initial production), and full-rate production. Defense program managers would be free to manage the program without further Congressional authorization, unless costs or performance deviate by some preset amount from the baseline upon which the milestone authorization was approved.

The committee considers this to be a superior approach to Congressional oversight and an important tool for an enterprise program manager. Section 2225 establishes the legal framework for the submission and approval of milestone authorization requests. The Secretary of Defense is required under this section to submit a milestone authorization request accompanied by a program management baseline within 90 days after a program is selected as a defense enterprise program.

The committee serves notice to the Department of Defense that milestone authorizations will not be granted lightly. Programs will be reviewed thoroughly and alternatives will be examined. However, if the committee approves a milestone authorization request for an enterprise program, it will be equally diligent in minimizing further Congressional interference as long as the program conforms to the program management baseline submitted with the request.

PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT CONTACTS BY CERTAIN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OFFICIALS

In the Department of Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1986 (P.L. 99–145), three provisions were included to limit activities of certain Department of Defense personnel with respect to post-government employment. Section 921 prohibits Presidential appointees in Federal employment accepting for a two-year period post-government employment with any defense contractor with whom they acted as a primary government representative in the negotiation or settlement of a government contract. Section 922 significantly strengthens the requirements for reporting and disclosure for employees of the Department of Defense and members of the Armed Services who leave the government to work for a defense contractor. Section 923 established a procedure for Department of Defense acquisition personnel at levels O–4 and GS–11 and above to report contacts with a contractor regarding future employment possibilities and to disqualify themselves from any further actions relating to that contractor.

Since the enactment of P.L. 99–145, there has been considerable confusion regarding the scope of coverage of section 921. It has been construed by some to cover civilian Presidential appointees only, while others have asserted the scope of coverage to include all officers in the Armed Services as well, by virtue of the fact that they are also appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The committee believes that, with the exception of section 921, the current provisions limiting contacts between defense acquisition personnel and defense contractors regarding post-government employment are sound and should be given time to become institutionalized before any further changes are contemplated.

Because of the unresolved issue of the application of the prohibition and the uncertainty of the impact of a two-year ban on the ability of the Department of Defense to attract and retain qualified executives to serve in key acquisition assignments, the committee has approved a repeal of section 921 and the substitution of sections 931 and 932.

Sections 931 and 932 are consistent with a recommendation in the National Academy of Public Administration report entitled *Leadership in Jeopardy: The Fraying of the Presidential Appointments System*, which was endorsed by the Packard Commission. It prohibits fifteen named senior defense officials from having any discussions with a defense contractor regarding future employment opportunities during their period of Federal employment. In return, a covered official would be eligible for severance pay based on the length of service in his senior government position.

Section 931 would create a new section 2397b in title 10 U.S.C. In section 2397b fifteen senior defense officials are specifically covered, as well as any other official designated by the President in an executive order 180 days before the date of the official's appointment. Such officials are prohibited from having any discussions with any defense contractors regarding possible future employment as long as they work in the Department of Defense. Under this new section, those covered senior defense officials with at least 24 months of consecutive service would be eligible for between one and three months equivalent severance pay. Those covered officials with between 36 and 48 months of consecutive service would be eligible for up to four months equivalent severance pay. Those with 48 months or longer would be eligible to receive up to five months equivalent severance pay.

Section 2397b provides that severance pay will only be paid for the period of time between the date the covered official leaves the government and the date he commences employment outside the Federal Government. In the case of a covered official who immediately begins employment upon leaving government service, only one month equivalent severance pay would be provided. The section further provides that in the case of a covered official who is terminated because of a change of Presidents, the official will be credited with a sufficient number of months for purposes of this section to provide him with a credited number of months divisible by 12. Finally, those covered officials who would be eligible to receive a civil service or military retirement pension on the date they leave government service will be ineligible to receive any severance pay.

Under section 932, any covered senior defense official who has a contact with a defense contractor regarding future employment and fails to report it would be subject to a $10,000 administrative penalty and a ten-year bar on accepting or continuing employment with the defense contractor.

COMMERCIAL PRICING FOR SPARE OR REPAIR PARTS

The Department of Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1985 (P.L. 98-525) included a provision (section 2323, title 10 U.S.C.) that was intended to preclude the Defense Department from entering a contract using other than competitive procedures for the purchase of items for a price that exceeds the lowest price at which such items are sold to the public. Since the provision was enacted, there has been confusion over the intended scope of application of this requirement, the meaning of certain terms in the section, and the records which contractors would have to make available to support the certification statement.

The first draft of the implementing regulations for section 2323 (Federal Acquisition Circular 84-10, Item III) was submitted by the Department of Defense to the Office of Management and Budget on June 27, 1985. The draft was rejected by OMB in September 1985. A similar second draft was rejected by OMB in February 1986. In OMB's view, the proposed implementing regulations exceeded the requirements of the underlying statute and imposed unjustified recordkeeping requirements on defense contractors. A third revised draft was submitted to the Office of Management and Budget on April 16, 1986. A final decision by OMB on these implementing regulations is pending.

The committee believes that the draft implementing regulations issued by the Department of Defense thus far have exceeded the intent behind the original legislation in three major areas. First, regulatory coverage has been proposed for contracts for all items, not merely for contracts for spare or repair parts. Second, the coverage of the certification requirement has been proposed to extend beyond contracts awarded by other than competitive procedures under the Competition in Contracting Act. Finally, the reference to "sale to the public" in section 2323 has been construed in the regulations to include sales to other Federal agencies as well as sales to the contractor's dealers and other remarketers.

In order to clarify Congressional intent on these issues, the committee has approved a series of amendments to the section. These amendments represent an attempt to reduce potential recordkeeping burdens for commercial suppliers who must comply with the commercial price certification requirement, while protecting the interests of the taxpayer.

The changes in section 941 limit the application of this requirement to those contracts for spare or repair parts. For the purposes of this section, spare or repair part has been defined as any individual piece, part, subassembly, or component which is furnished for the logistic support or repair of an end item, rather than as an end item itself. Most of the Congressional debate and discussion on the original legislation concerned spare or repair parts. Given the additional fact that the parallel statute in title 41 (section 253e) limits coverage of the certification requirement to contracts for spare or replacement parts, the committee believes that the commercial price certification requirement should be similarly limited for defense contracts at the present time.

The committee does recognize, however, that a cost/benefit analysis may justify expanding the coverage of the certification requirement to contracts for all items of supply. Therefore the committee directs the Department of Defense to prepare such a cost/benefit analysis at the end of the three-year period beginning on October 1, 1986 and to submit the results of this analysis to the Committees on Armed Services of the House and Senate with the annual defense budget request for fiscal year 1991. The analysis should identify, if possible, the savings realized in the purchase of spare or repair parts attributed to this section and the possible savings that could be realized from expanding its coverage and address the paperwork and recordkeeping burden involved with the expansion of coverage, as well as any difficulties encountered with defining spare or repair parts for the purposes of the current restricted coverage.

The committee recognizes that clearly distinguishing between spare or repair parts and end items will be difficult in many cases. The committee considered defining spare or repair parts as those items so offered by the contractor to the general public "in the normal course of business" and rejected this approach. The committee intends that the term "spare or repair part" refer to an integral manufactured and replaceable part of a piece of machinery or equipment, the part being furnished normally for replacing a part worn or damaged in service.

Section 941 also adds a definition of the term "lowest commercial price" for purposes of section 2323 on the basis of exemptions. The first exemption to the term "lowest commercial price" is the price for which a contractor sells a part to any person for resale after that person performs some service or function that adds to the cost of the part. The committee intends thus to exclude sales to a contractor's dealers, original equipment manufacturers, and other remarketers. However, the exemption does provide that the Defense Department may consider such sales for purposes of determining the contractors lowest commercial price when the Defense Department is buying under the same terms and conditions as a contractor's dealers, original equipment manufacturers and other remarketers.

The second exemption excludes sales to any of the contractor's subsidiaries, affiliates, parent business organizations, or other branches of the same business entity.

The third exemption excludes sales to any person at a price substantially discounted below the fair market or regular price for donation purposes.

The fourth exemption applies to sales to customers located outside the United States. Because of fluctuations in currency exchange rates and other factors, the committee believes that such sales should not be used as a basis for a contractor certification.

Finally, the committee included a temporary exemption excluding sales to other agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government from the definition of the term "lowest commercial price." It was not the intent of the original legislation that sales to other Federal agencies be considered as commercial sales to the public. Sales to the Federal Government as a class apart from sales to the general public are recognized in Federal Acquisition Regulation 15.804-3(c). This distinction is recognized in other government contracting documents as well. However, the committee believes that sales to other Federal agencies may be relevant for purposes of general price comparison. The committee has therefore provided that this exemption will expire one year from the date of implementation of this section, as amended in the Defense Acquisition Reorganization and Improvements Act. For the purposes of this section, date of implementation means the date on which the final regulations are published in the *Federal Register* after the notice and comment period provided in section 418b of title 41 U.S.C.

The committee directs the Department of Defense to report to the Committees on Armed Services of the House and Senate 60 days before the end of this one-year period on the advisability of making permanent the exemption of sales to other Federal agencies. This report should address the potential cost and benefits of removing this exemption and provide an estimate of the recordkeeping burdens on contractors.

Section 941 also includes language reemphasizing the committee's intent that the commercial price certification requirement apply to only those contracts awarded using other than competitive procedures. For the purposes of this section the committee considers the term "other than competitive procedures" to cover those contracts awarded using the exemptions provided in section 2304 (c) of title 10 U.S.C. and those contracts awarded on the basis of competitive negotiation in which only one bidder has responded. The committee believes that the contracting officer should not be burdened with making a further determination on the adequacy of price competition in a given procurement solely for purposes of applying the commercial price certification requirement.

Finally, section 941 clarifies the records that contractors must make available to support their certification statement. It is the committee's clear intent that the requirement to provide supporting data not be used by the Department of Defense as a pretext for requiring contractors to disclose the data relating to the underlying elements of the prices of commercial products. The committee does intend, however, that contractors maintain and make data available showing the records of sales of relevant parts for the period covered by the certification statement.

REGULATIONS FOR ALLOCATING OVERHEAD TO PARTS TO WHICH THE CONTRACTOR HAS ADDED LITTLE VALUE

Section 1245 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1985 (P.L. 98–525) required the Secretary of Defense to prescribe regulations specifying the incurred overhead a contractor may properly allocate to supplies and requiring the contractor to identify those supplies which it did not manufacture or to which it did not contribute significant value. This provision was aimed at the outrageous overhead costs that were passed on to the Department of Defense on such common items of supply as hammers, which bore no apparent relationship to the item of supply in question. It was also intended to identify opportunities for breakout purchases by the Department of Defense of supplies manufactured by subcontractors, but sold through prime contractors.

Consistent with the recommendations of the Packard Commission on streamlining the purchase of commercial products, the committee believes that such information should not be required from commercial suppliers or manufacturers who are selling items of supply to the Department of Defense at established catalogue or market prices. In the committee's view, the prices of such items of supply have been determined by the marketplace and to require this class of contractor to supply the additional data required under section 1245 is unnecessary. The committee directs that the current procedure contained in FAR 15.804–3 for establishing a commerciality exemption from the submission of certified cost and pricing data be used in implementing this section.

REPEAL OF COST AND PRICE MANAGEMENT PROVISIONS

Section 917 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1986 (P.L. 99–145) established a requirement that defense contractors record certain categories of data relating to bills of labor and material for defense contracts of over $100,000 in value. A key subsection of this new provision (2406 (b)(2)(B) of title 10 U.S.C.) requires contractors to specify standard labor hours in the bill of labor using current industrial engineering standard hours of work content based on commercially available, predetermined time standards.

This section was inserted into the Defense Authorization Act without the benefit of hearings or review by the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate. Since the enactment of this provision, witnesses before the Senate Armed Services Committee have been virtually unanimous in their view that the current provision is confusing regarding the information it requires and that the benefits of the requirements are uncertain when compared to the potential costs. Not only representatives from industry associations, but also the Director of the Defense Contract Audit Agency and the Deputy Inspector General of the Department of Defense testified that section 2406 should be repealed.

The committee strongly supports the use of so-called industrial work measurement standards as a means of improving the efficiency of defense manufacturers. The committee notes with approval the efforts of Department of Defense to implement agency-wide tailored work measurement standard requirements on the basis of Military Standard 1567A. However, because of the objections noted above, the committee has included a provision repealing section 2406 of title 10 U.S.C.

APPLICATION OF REQUIREMENTS TO MARK SUPPLIES TO IDENTIFY SUPPLIERS AND SOURCES

This section includes a similar exemption to that in section 944 above and the rationale is also similar. The committee recognizes that some potential for breakout will be eliminated by including this exemption in section 2384 of title 10 U.S.C. However, the committee believes that streamlining the acquisition of commercial products is a higher priority.

The committee directs that the procedures established in FAR 15.804-3 to establish a commerciality exemption from the submission of certified cost and pricing data be used to implement this section.

NONDEVELOPMENT ITEMS

The Packard Commission Report, *A Formula for Action*, contained the following recommendation:

"Rather than relying on excessively rigid military specifications, DOD should make greater use of components, systems, and services available 'off-the-shelf.' It should develop new or custom-made items only when it has been established that those currently available are clearly inadequate to meet military requirements."

This is the latest in a long series of recommendations, reports and initiatives that have supported a commercial product procurement policy. Even though there appears to be general agreement that increased use of off-the-shelf items ranging from fruitcakes to trucks would result in more cost effective procurement, the long standing bias to use detailed military specifications remains.

Section 945 is intended to break that bias and to establish a preference for the procurement, where appropriate, of items referred to as nondevelopment items (NDIs). As the name implies, nondevelopment items do not require additional development costs; they are already available in the marketplace. This term differs from off-the-shelf in that it includes commercial products and products in use by other federal agencies that may require minor modification to meet the identified need.

The section would create a new section 2325 which contains two basic provisions. First, the services must define requirements for the procurement of equipment and supplies so that, to the extent practicable, nondevelopment items can be used. In practice this may mean that the requirements would be stated in performance or functional terms as authorized under the Competition in Contracting Act rather than in detailed design terms. Second, the Services are required to actually fulfill, to the extent practicable, their requirements using NDIs. This would mean that a new item would only be developed if no acceptable item was already available in the marketplace.

Under this section DOD is also required to issue implementing regulations and to submit a report to Congress within one year that details the actions taken to implement these requirements. The committee will carefully evaluate this report and strongly urges the Secretary of Defense to consider innovative means, such as cash awards or other incentives, to encourage greater consideration and use of non-developmental items to meet defense requirements.

It is the intent of the committee to ensure that those who are responsible for procuring military equipment and supplies think first about using items already developed and available (even if minor modifications are needed) and that detailed military specifications are only used when no product capable of fulfilling DOD's needs is already in existence.

REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO OTHER THAN COMPETITIVE PROCEDURES

The Competition in Contracting Act included two explanatory provisions with regard to the first exception from using competitive procedures, one dealing with unsolicited proposals and the other dealing with follow-on contracts. The purpose of the proposed amendments to the Competition in Contracting Act is to recognize that the test for awarding a contract to an unsolicited proposal on a non-competitive basis should be that the service demonstrates a unique or innovative concept or that the offerer has a unique capability. In some cases, the services themselves may not be unique, but the capability of the offerer to provide the service may be unique.

The second change in this provision simply recognizes that follow-on contracts for services should be dealt with on the same basis as follow-on contracts for products.

EVALUATION FACTORS IN AWARD OF CONTRACTS

Testimony before the committee indicated that competitive procurements for sophisticated professional and technical services are often conducted with price as the key evaluation factor. This view has been expressed by the Packard Commission, by DOD witnesses, and by industry representatives.

The committee recognizes that the procurement evaluation process for professional and technical services for today's complex programs should be different from the process utilized for acquiring goods or routine services. It believes that in the acquisition process for sophisticated professional and technical services, emphasis generally needs to be placed on the quality of the services offered—including technical capability, management capability, and prior experience of the offerer. There needs, of course, to be a proper balance between price and quality of the services.

The committee is aware that current regulations permit weightings favoring quality of the services and technical capabilities, but finds that in actual practice, political and institutional considerations have often resulted in the acceptance of the low bid by procurement authorities. The committee recognizes that this may occur because evaluation of service quality is more subjective than comparison of price. Justification based on price may be less subject to controversy than justification based on quality assessment. To assure the greatest benefit to the government in procuring sophisticated professional and technical services, it is essential that quality of the service be given appropriate weight related to cost and price factors.

To achieve this objective, and to assist officials responsible for procuring sophisticated systems, the committee is adding a new section to the Competition in Contracting Act to specifically recognize the importance of quality as a factor in professional and technical services procurement. This amendment will clarify the law to indicate such priority for quality is permissible.

OFFSETS FOR CONTRACT ADJUSTMENTS RELATING TO DEFECTIVE COST AND PRICING DATA

The Truth in Negotiations Act, 10 U.S.C. 2306 (f), specifies that contractors must furnish and certify that they furnished current, accurate and complete cost or pricing data during contract negotiations with the Department of Defense. The Department of Defense is entitled to a decrease in the negotiated contract price if the contractor's failure to comply with this requirement caused an increase in price. Failure to provide current, accurate and complete data is known as defective pricing.

In *Cutler-Hammer, Inc., vs. United States*, 189 CT. Cl. 76, 416 F.2d 1306 (1969), the court established the concept of "offset" which allows the contractor to reduce the amount of the defective pricing by the amount by which the cost or pricing data submitted by the contractor was understated. This concept, which is not referred to in the Truth in Negotiations Act, has been expanded upon in subsequent decisions to the point that in a recent appeal of an ASBCA decision, *United States vs. Rogerson Aircraft Controls*, 785 Fed. 2d 296, the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit permitted a contractor's estimate to be used as an offset and went so far as to suggest the possibility of intentional understatement being used as an offset when the court said:

"Accordingly, we affirm the ASBCA, leaving still undecided by this court the issue whether a deliberate, deceptive (or misleading) understatement (i.e., an intentional understatement which is unknown to the government) can be offset in a defective pricing case".

In *Rogerson* the offset principle under the Truth in Negotiations Act was misapplied. The contractor inadvertently overstated his material costs and, in applying his judgment to verifiable factual data, intentionally estimated his overhead rates lower than indicated by the historical data. The contractor was permitted to offset the material costs overstatements (factual data) with the intentionally reduced overhead rates (judgmental data). Cost or pricing data are factual data which can be verified and have always been distinguished from judgmental data. This amendment would include in the statute the distinction between cost or pricing data and judgmental data and would eliminate judgmental data and intentional understatements of cost or pricing data as offsets.

ALTERNATIVE PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

This part addresses the need to improve the quality of the Defense Department's scientific, technical and acquisition activities by enabling the Department to attract and retain the most capable workforce possible through the creation of an alternative personnel management system.

There is ample evidence that the existing civil service personnel system is simply not working. The committee believes this is particularly true in the scientific, technical and acquisition work force. These were among the most critical findings of a 1983 White House Science Council panel and a recent Presidential Commission, both of which were chaired by the distinguished industrialist and former Deputy Secretary of Defense, David Packard. The panel and the commission found that the inflexibility of the existing civil service personnel system inhibited the ability of senior defense managers to attract, motivate and retain skilled professional people of the quality needed.

The committee is aware and grateful that there are many competent and dedicated civilians and military personnel in the defense research and acquisition workforce and the committee's legislative initiative is not intended in any way to disparage their efforts. Indeed the committee believes its decision to move toward a performance-based, rather than a longevity-based system is an attempt to recognize their efforts and to reward their accomplishments.

The part authorizes the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the Office of Personnel Management, to establish alternative personnel management systems on the bases of (1) critical occupational skills, (2) organizations that are engaged in the crucial defense activities of research, development, or acquisition; or (3) both of the above.

The committee is building upon the demonstration projects conducted at the China Lake Naval Weapons Center (NWC) and the San Diego Naval Ocean Systems Center (NOSC). The committee is convinced by the empirical data that both of these demonstration projects have been successes and expects expansion of those efforts. This data also demonstrates that higher quality personnel are being successfully recruited and top performers are being retained preferentially at both centers.

At NOSC all white collar personnel are involved in the demonstration project. At NWC clerical employees have not been included and remain covered by the general schedule. Both an organization-wide approach (such as at NOSC) and an occupation-by-occupation approach (such as at NWC) have merit depending on the circumstances under which an alternative personnel management system is implemented. The committee has provided the department the flexibility to choose the approach which best meets its needs in each instance.

In general, rather than attempting to prejudge or to inhibit innovative efforts, the committee thinks it is important to provide a flexible framework for action and to encourage Defense Department officials to move responsibly and promptly.

The section requires that the system or systems established meet several criteria. For instance, each system must be cost neutral compared with retaining the existing civil service system for the employees coming under it. The Secretaries of the Military Departments or the Secretary of Defense will designate which positions are to be converted to the alternative system, but the Secretary of Defense determines how many positions will be converted. No growth will occur and positions converted will come out of existing personnel limitations. Quality raises for top performers will have to come at the expense of salary freezes of their less productive colleagues or from attrition in the work force. The committee expects that over time the result will be a smaller, higher quality scientific, technical and acquisition work force. The Packard Commission has made it clear that is the direction in which we should be moving.

The committee is aware that a broader, more comprehensive alternative personnel management system, based on the Navy demonstration projects, is now being formulated in the Executive Branch. It is our intention that any system developed by the Secretary of Defense, working with the Office of Personnel Management, will be constructed to fit into that more comprehensive system when it is adopted. The committee has taken pains to assure there will not be several incompatible systems in being if the administration's proposal comes to fruition.

First, any system or systems developed must be approved by the Office of Personnel Management. Moreover, all the regulations implementing the system or systems are to be developed in consultation with the Office of Personnel Management, including any transitional regulations. With the Department of Defense and the Office of Personnel Management working together on innovative proposals, within the broad guidelines of the part, no incompatability should occur.

In addition, the part contains a sunsetting provision which makes clear that this urgent discretionary authority is intended to provide a framework for action while the more comprehensive overhaul of the civil service system works its way through the legislative process.

The section provides flexible provisions for pay and other benefits to permit the Defense Department to compete more effectively for senior management personnel with the private sector. They are there to be used, but used with the knowledge that public employment can never compete dollar-for-dollar with the private sector. Public service always involves some monetary sacrifice and this part will not change that basic precept. The part recognizes that there are some relatively few positions that require special talent or experience and where the government has to provide more compensation to get that service. In those instances, the Secretary of Defense may designate those positions which require specially qualified persons to perform.

The pay cap for the alternative personnel management system is set at the level of Executive Level IV, except for those relatively few positions (up to 5% of the alternative system's work force) requiring specially qualified people. For those positions, the Secretary concerned can establish the pay at a higher level. An absolute salary cap is set at the level now paid for directors of government-owned, contractor-operated national research laboratories. Special provisions are set up to approve pay for all positions compensated at the specially qualified personnel salary levels.

The legislation requires the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition to perform oversight reviews of the competence of the scientific, technical and acquisition workforces and to make periodic reports thereon to the Secretary. If there are changes in emphasis for critical occupations or other recommendations for improvement, the Under Secretary should make his views known to the Secretary.

The section also requires additional emphasis on the training of the acquisition work force. The Packard Commission particularly highlighted the need for effective action to be taken to ameliorate long-standing problems with improving the professionalism of civilian acquisition personnel. The Commission went on to state that contract specialists have an especially critical role among acquisition personnel, and yet the Office of Personnel Management continues to designate these positions as administrative, not professional. The committee expects that this bill will provide sufficient impetus for the Secretary with the cooperation of the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, to correct this anomaly in the acquisition system. There is no resource more important to efficient operation of the defense acquisition system than the people who have to make it work.

FOREIGN POLICY AND NATIONAL SECURITY CONSIDERATIONS IN DEFENSE CONTRACTING

Recently it has become clear that there may be a conflict between U.S. defense contracting procedures and broader U.S. foreign policy objectives. Specifically, a wholly-owned U.S. subsidiary of an Italian firm, nearly 15 per cent of which is owned by an official financial arm of the Libyan government, was the lowest bidder on a contract to supply tractor crawlers to the U.S. Marine Corps. On May 1, 1986, during a hearing held by the Defense Acquisition Policy Subcommittee on this issue, the Undersecretary of Defense for Policy stated that there is no current statute that provides clear authority to authorize the Department of Defense to deny a contract to a low bidder which is under any degree of foreign government ownership or control, when the award of the contract would be inimical to U.S. foreign policy or national security.

The committee believes that U.S. defense contracting procedures should not be allowed to undermine U.S. foreign policy objectives. Therefore, the committee recommends for approval a provision which is designed to insure that the Department of Defense has adequate authority to deal with this problem in the future. The new system has three major provisions.

First, the committee proposal requires disclosure by a firm submitting a bid whether any part of the firm is owned or controlled by a foreign government or by an agent or instrumentality of a foreign government. The committee recognizes that a firm, whose stock is publicly traded may not have completely current information on every stockholder; therefore this disclosure is to be on the basis of the firm's best information and belief.

Second, the committee proposal provides that the head of a Department of Defense agency shall not enter into a contract for an amount that exceeds $100,000 with any contractor owned or controlled, in whole or any significant part, by a foreign government if it is determined that such a contract award is inconsistent with the foreign policy interests or national security objectives of the United States. The committee has not provided a definition of what is to be considered "significant" ownership or control. It recognizes that "significant" ownership or control may vary with the particular stock ownership structure of the firm involved.

In considering significant foreign government ownership or control, the committee strongly believes that the issue of control, through ownership of a certain percentage of publicly held stock in a corporation, is only one of many criteria upon which to base a judgment for the purposes of this bill. In determining whether a particular contract award is in the best interests of the United States, the total value of the stock held by a foreign government, the amount of stock dividends received by the foreign government as a result of that ownership, a foreign government's representation on a firm's board of directors, and the potential access to sensitive technical data a foreign government might acquire as a result of significant ownership or control must all be taken into consideration in determining the propriety of any contract award.

By providing the Department of Defense with the means to deny those contract awards which could result in financial benefit to a nation which supports international terrorism, the committee intends this legislation to serve as demonstration to the international community of the seriousness with which the Congress views the problem of state-sponsored terrorism. If the civilized world is ever to successfully combat international terrorism, financial and commercial relationships with terrorist-supporting regimes must be severed. Joint economic action, through international cooperation, is an especially effective weapon in combatting the problem of state-supported terrorism. Therefore, the committee believes that actions taken toward this end by foreign governments and corporations friendly to the United States should also be taken into consideration when determining the propriety of a contract award.

Third, the committee proposal requires the head of an agency to report to Congress prior to entering into a contract with a contractor that is owned or controlled, in whole or in significant part, by a foreign government (or agent or instrumentality of a foreign government) that the Secretary of State has determined has repeatedly provided support to international terrorists. In addition, the section specifies the information that is to be included in the report, but does not require Congressional approval prior to the execution of the contract.

The committee recognizes that there is no reason to require subsequent reports regarding a contractor who has been the subject of a prior report to Congress unless the relevant information already reported to Congress has changed. Moreover, some foreign firms have pointed out that they must enter into joint ventures with U.S. firms in order to bid on defense contracts. If every contract is subject to the reporting requirement, these foreign firms would be placed at a disadvantage because they could not assure potential U.S. partners that they would be approved by the head of the agency. This provision gives those firms, and their U.S. partners, the assurance that once they had been approved by the head of the agency, they could develop joint ventures and otherwise bid on defense contracts with a degree of predictability that they would not otherwise have. This will assist in the development of joint ventures between U.S. companies and companies in allied countries, a goal long fostered by this committee.

Thus, the committee proposal provides that the head of the agency need not submit a report before entering into subsequent contracts with the contractor unless the information already reported has materially changed. Factors that are to be taken into account when determining a material change include the size and value of the contract, the scope and sensitivity of the contract, and increases in the extent of foreign government ownership or control.

The head of the agency is still free to submit a report if he believes it prudent to do so. It is the committee's expectation that the Secretary of Defense will be very circumspect in the exercise of this power to enter into subsequent contracts with firms that have significant interests controlled by governments which support terrorism without notifying Congress.

DOD FAR SUPPLEMENT

An area of continuing concern to this subcommittee is the extent to which the Services and the Defense Logistics Agency have been successful in maximizing competition at the subcontract level. The DOD policy relative to this issue is contained in the DOD FAR Supplement (S. 1-207.4(F)) which states that "A reporting procedure which compares actual competitive experience with a previously analyzed potential is an essential element of a good purchasing system." Although this requirement does not specify that a purchasing system that does not (i) analyze and estimate the potential for competition on subcontracts and (ii) report on the actual level of competition that is achieved, is automatically unacceptable, it does strongly indicate that these system characteristics must be considered when evaluating a contractor's purchasing system. An analysis that the committee performed relative to this provision indicated that the Services and the Defense Logistics Agency were inconsistent in what they did to comply with the referenced FAR Supplement provision. The implementation has ranged from mandating that contractors establish a formal reporting system (although this reporting system does not reference a comparison of potential to actual subcontract competition) to completely ignoring the requirement. The DAR Council is currently considering two cases which may resolve the inconsistency on the reporting issue.

OSD should evaluate this FAR Supplement provision and determine whether the referenced criteria remain essential elements of a "good" purchasing system. If this is the case, OSD should ensure that the Service and DLA procedures are revised to require that contractor purchasing systems comply with the criteria. If the criteria are not necessary, the FAR Supplement provision should be revised or eliminated. OSD should notify this committee as to the actions that have been taken to evaluate and resolve this issue.

TITLE X—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMY MATTERS

The committee recommends enactment of the provisions set forth below which are designed to reduce the overhead and labor costs of the Department of Defense. The committee believes that these provisions, applicable only to DOD, will offer more efficiency and economy in defense matters.

DAVIS-BACON ACT

For the Davis-Bacon Act, the committee recommends the minimum contract size threshold be increased from the current $2,000 level to $250,000. Based on data from the Federal Procurement Data File (FPDF) for fiscal year 1985, this increase would exempt about 12 percent of DOD contract dollars and about 70 percent of the contracts that would be covered by the Davis-Bacon Act under current law. This threshold increase would reduce outlays by about $9 million in 1987 and by about $111 million over the next five years.

SERVICE CONTRACTING ACT

The Service Contracting Act, enacted in 1965 and expanded by amendments in 1972 and 1976, is the last (and least known) of the federal "prevailing wage" laws. Patterned after the Davis-Bacon (1931) and Walsh-Healey (1936) Acts, the SCA requires the Secretary of Labor to make prevailing wage and benefits determinations for services employees working on government contracts of $2,500 or more.

The original SCA was intended to provide wage protection to a group of generally low-paid employees, such as cleaning and food service workers, who at the time (they have since been covered) were exempted from the minimum wage provisions of the fair Labor Standard Act (FLSA). In practice, the SCA has been extended to apply to technical and other generously compensated workers who, like the construction workers covered by Davis-Bacon, arguably do not need federal prevailing wage law protection.

The U.S. General Accounting Office, the Congressional Budget Office, and the Grace Commission have all stated that SCA artificially raises federal contracting costs. Prior to this year there have been no serious efforts to reform or repeal the law. The Labor Department did revise its SCA implementing regulations in late 1983 in an attempt to eliminate some of the administrative burdens imposed by the law. This portion would codify some of those changes in addition to making several substantive amendments.

The major changes would be made to the Service Contract Act (for DOD contracts only) are:

Raise the contract coverage threshold from $2,500 to $1 million

SCA currently applies to any government service contract of $2,500 or more. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates that in 1985, the SCA applied to $6.1 billion worth of DOD contracts, of which about $1.4 billion, or 24% was in contracts of $1,000,000 or less. This leaves $4.7 billion, or 77% of the dollar amount of SCA-covered DOD contracts in contracts of $1,000,000 or more. Although only 24% of the total value of the contracts was below $1,000,000, about 89% of all contracts fell below this threshold.

The increase in the threshold would continue SCA application to large service contracts and exempt many smaller contracts, approximately 90.6%, without significantly affecting the law's dollar coverage. The dollar value of contracts exempted with the higher threshold is assumed in the CBO baseline to grow to $1.6 billion dollars in 1987 and to $1.9 billion by 1991. CBO estimates that this revision to increase the dollar threshold for contracts covered under SCA from $2,500 to $1,000,000 for DOD contracts would save the federal government $60 million in outlays in 1987 and about $344 million over the next five years.

Codify the 1983 DOL revised regulation applying the Act only to contracts which as a whole provide services

Under revised SCA regulations issued by the Labor Department in 1983, the law will be applied only to those contracts the principal purpose of which is to furnish services. This provision would codify the DOL changes, thereby precluding a future administration from reinstating the old interpretation.

Providing that wages and benefits in a "successor" contract shall apply unless the Secretary of Labor can show that such wages are not prevailing

One of the most controversial provisions of the SCA requires a successor service contractor to pay wages and benefits no lower than those which a predecessor service contractor was obligated to pay under a collective bargaining agreement, unless the Secretary of Labor determines that such benefits are "substantially at variance" with local prevailing rates. The rationale for this requirement is to prevent successor contractors from rehiring the predecessor's workers at lower wage rates than they were entitled to under their union contract. In practice, the provision works to perpetuate union rates once they have been established in a service contract, and stifles competitive bidding. The "variance" procedure, because it is both burdensome and time-consuming, has been of little value to successor contractors in preventing the application of predecessor contracts.

The proposed reform in effect reverses application of the successor clause by putting the burden on the Secretary to establish that the wages and benefits provided for under the successor contract are not prevailing within the meaning of the SCA. In other words, the wages and benefits in the successor contract would be permitted to go into effect unless the Secretary can show that such wages are not prevailing within the locality where the work is performed (see next section for definition of prevailing rates). The Secretary would have to establish, through a formal hearing at which the successor contractor could present evidence, that the successor contract wages are lower than any wages paid to similar jobs anywhere in the area where the work is to be performed. Only where the Secretary successfully meets this burden will the union rates in the predecessor contract be applied to the successor contract.

The impact of the elimination of the successor provision with regard to contracts awarded by DOD, in combination with the higher threshold, would save about $80 million in 1987 and about $457 million over the next five years. This estimate is based on the assumption that about 8% of SCA contracts are subject to the current successorship provision and that this raises costs by about 1.7% on average, for contracts in excess of the SCA contract threshold.

Define "prevailing rates" to mean the range of wages paid to similar jobs and "locality" to mean the particular geographic area where the work is performed

Perhaps by express design, the original SCA and the 1972 and 1976 amendments never defined the key terms "prevailing rates" and "locality". Thus, interpretation of what these terms mean has been left up to the Department of Labor through its implementing regulations. The GAO has found that DOL consistently requires SCA rates higher than those that are typically found for similar jobs within the area where the work is performed.

This proposal for the first time defines "prevailing rate" to mean the range of wages and benefits paid to similar jobs in the locality and "locality" mean the particular urban or rural subdivision, presumably in most cases the county, where the work is actually performed. Thus, under the proposed definition of prevailing rate, the Secretary would be required to deem as prevailing any wage rate within a certain range of wages as long as there was some evidence to show that wages within the range were being paid within the locality. A service contractor's bid would qualify for SCA purposes provided its wage rates were not lower than the applicable range of wages. By defining prevailing rate in this way, competition will be encouraged by involving more local contractors in the bidding process while avoiding the possibility that local wage rates will be undercut.

Limit the Secretary of Labor's mandatory wage and benefit determinations to contracts which employ 25 or more service employees

This SCA revision made in the DOD Authorization would require the Secretary of Labor to make wage and benefit determinations only for those service contracts which employ 25 or more service workers. Under current law, the Secretary is obligated to make such determinations for any service contract under which 5 or more service employees are involved.

According to the Department of Labor, since enactment of the Service Contract Act, five major legislative and regulatory actions have increased the SCA wage determinations workload by close to 400%. The growing SCA wage determinations workload resulted in increased delays in processing requests for wage determinations.

The Wage Determination office in the Department of Labor is becoming a bottleneck in the system. If the wage determinations are required only on studies of 25 employees or more, there will be a smaller workload, faster action on studies under 25, and furthermore, faster issuance of wage determinations in those over 25 employees.

Non-applicability to certain Mariner Service contracts

This provision would correct the current situation where Department of Labor wage and benefit determinations for the maritime industry are far in excess of Civil Service wages and benefits—some benefits more than 300 percent greater and some wages more than 33 percent greater. Those high wage determinations present a handicap to private sector bidders in any OMB Circular A-76 competition that is virtually insurmountable. In effect, this provision would permit the private sector to compete with in-house operation on a level playing field, providing the potential of significant cost savings to the U.S. Government. Because many mariner service contracts are primarily for operations outside U.S. territory where the Service Contract Act does not apply yet the bidder does not know precisely how long the vessel will operate in U.S. waters and how long it will not due to the character of military operations and requirements, this provision would also make the bidding process for private sector operators more fair by enabling them to calculate wage costs according to a clear, known standard that does not vary unpredictably within the period of a contract.

The committee intends that this provision shall apply to all types of vessel charters, to include time as well as bareboat charters. The committee also intends that all mariner service contracts previously executed without the application of the Service Contract Act of 1965 shall be valid for their duration without the application of the Service Contract Act.

CONTRACTING OUT PROVISIONS

Threshold Increase from 40 to 50 for Simplified Contracting Out

The committee accepted this provision which raises the contracting out threshold from 40 to 50 civilian workyears before a Full Cost Comparison is required. Under 50 civilian workyears will be determined by a Simplified Cost Comparison. Simplified cost comparisons require that the federal agency compute its costs to perform a function and compare it with a contractor bid. The lower of the two will win the job. This is an efficient way to determine if contracting out is beneficial to the government.

The committee believes this provision is needed to expand the proposed threshold to help in alleviating the tremendous backlog of position determinations in DOD.

Mandatory Contracting Out Provision

This provision will enable private industry to compete with the government sector wherever possible with the following exceptions: Firefighters (see applicable bill language) will be exempted one more year, but the results of DOD and U.S. Fire Administrator reports due the January 15, 1987 will determine what positions will be able to be contracted out in the future, and Core Logistics functions as determined by last year's authorization bill.

This amendment will allow for the lowest cost to be paid by DOD.

Realistic and Fair Cost Comparisons

DOD handicaps contractors' bidding on services and supplies during cost comparisons against retaining these functions in-house. In addition to the existing 10% bias used to date, other handicaps are:

o Contract Administration Cost—The cost for the government to administer the contract if awarded to a private concern is added to the vendor's bid.

o Quality and Technical Assurance Cost—Quality and technical supervision and assurance are costs added to the vendors bid when contracting out work.

o Excessive liability coverage required and unrealistically low costs for government agencies.

o Overhead costs computed for the government bid.

Agency cost comparisons must be made more equal for determination of contracting out. Some DOD organizations have used these handicaps to their advantage in determining the cost comparison outcome. In addition to opening the door for more competition, the competitions must be conducted on an "apples to apples" basis. These cost comparisons are also the reason that an excessive backlog of evaluations will always exist. These are reasons why the DOD does not have to contract out if they choose not to. The cost comparisons should be able to be accomplished fairly and quickly. OMB must evaluate and modify their cost comparison regulations and enforce the intent of the contracting out goals.

TITLE XI—NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE

The committee has held a number of hearings and meetings during this past year in an attempt to resolve the issues surrounding the National Defense Stockpile. A number of resolutions have been reached, but a few remain. The issues of stockpile goals, methods of determination, and management remain.

A decision was reached to extend the prohibition on reducing current goals until April 1, 1987. This additional six month period is necessary for the committee, the administration, General Accounting Office (GAO), and other agencies/groups to complete ongoing actions.

A list of materials and quantities was selected for the administration to dispose of and what material and quantity to acquire. Other acquisitions are yet to be chosen. A limit of $120.0 million on disposals and acquisitions was determined. One material was directed to be procured for about $30 million. When known, the additional list of acquisitions, totaling about $90 million, will be forwarded to the Armed Services Committees for review. These lists will apply for fiscal year 1987. The $250 million cap is waived for fiscal year 1987 for transaction fund limits.

The use of the Stockpile Transaction Fund was expanded. Six additional uses are set out in bill language. In addition to the acquisitions, funds can be used to develop current specifications of stockpile materials. The specification in force today may not be acceptable to current manufacturing techniques and criteria. Updates in specifications and lack of quality in current stockpile materials may require upgrades in existing stockpile materials. The administration is expected to develop a plan to review specifications and material conditions leading to a recommended list of material upgrades. A recommended list of upgrades should be submitted to the Armed Services Committees during fiscal year 1987 and included in future legislation recommendations to the Congress. For example, claims have been made that we need more feroalloys in the stockpile to allow their quick introduction into the manufacturing process. Another example is the proposition that metals which are used in superalloys and as a binder for cemented carbides should be upgraded from existing materials. These claims require analysis, prioritization, and review, before transaction fund dollars are obligated.

When considering the payment of transportation costs to effect an upgrade of materials in the stockpile, the cost efficiency of such payment must be evaluated. If the payment of the transportation makes the upgrade uneconomical, the administration should consider requiring the contractor to pay such costs or not accomplishing the upgrade.

The committee is concerned that the stockpile may become outdated by technologies and future requirements. The President in

July 1985 directed studies of these potential problems. To date, no study results have been forwarded for review. Hopefully, these results will be available soon. Once some positive progress is seen in this area, the transaction fund resources may be used.

The committee strongly supports the current stockpile legislation (Section 9 of the Stockpiling Act) that requires amounts in the transaction fund to remain in the account. The committee objects strongly to the recommendation that transaction fund dollars be transferred to the general treasury accounts.

Between now and April 1, 1987, the parties have agreed to a number of actions in the hope of resolving remaining issues. This committee will hold hearings and receive inputs from a number of agencies and groups on the subjects of goals and stockpile management. The GAO will complete their analysis of the 1984/1985 stockpile study accomplished by the administration. The Department of Defense will complete their initial studies on future and exotic material needs, along with industrial and mobilization base requirements. The administration will review their current study for any changes within the past year and provide qualified personnel to brief and/or testify to this committee on stockpile policies.

All of the above actions should provide the information needed to address the remaining issues of stockpile goals and management.

TITLE XII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

GENERAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR PAY RAISES, FUEL COSTS, AND INFLATION ADJUSTMENTS

The bill includes a legislative provision to authorize additional appropriations as may be necessary for increases in salary, pay, retirement, and other employee benefits authorized by law for DOD civilian employees, and for unbudgeted increases in costs associated with inflation and the price of fuel.

EXCESS FUNDING REPORT

The fiscal year 1986 Defense Authorization Act contained a provision (Section 1407) which requires the Department of Defense to submit periodic reports on unobligated balances that are available for transfer to other purposes in Department of Defense accounts. The periodic reports were to coincide with the submission of the administration's budget, with the April Budget update, and with the Mid-session Budget Review.

When the Gramm-Rudman amendment was adopted, the entire schedule for consideration of the First Concurrent Resolution on the Budget was condensed. As a consequence of that shortening of the cycle, the April Budget Update was deleted as a formal administration report requirement. This in effect obviated the second periodic report required under Section 1407.

Despite the fact that the April report was not required by law, the Secretary of Defense did submit a report on unobligated balances. The committee commends the Secretary's willingness to comply with the spirit of Section 1407 even though there was no legal requirement to do so.

The committee included a provision which amends the original Section 1407 and substitutes three dates certain for the original triggering events.

REVISING SELECTED ACQUISITION REPORTS

The Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1986 (P.L. 99-145) contained a provision (Section 1201) revising the format and content of the Selected Acquisition Reports. The conferees on the Authorization Act also requested that the Department of Defense, the Congressional Budget Office and the General Accounting Office evaluate ways to improve the quality of the Selected Acquisition Report.

The committee reviewed the recommendations for amending the Selected Acquisition Report and has included a provision (Section 1203) which incorporates some of the changes recommended by the Department of Defense. The changes have the effect of bringing the SAR reporting criteria more in line with current Department of Defense acquisition policies for major systems.

More fundamental changes were suggested by the Congressional Budget Office and the General Accounting Office. The committee chose not to incorporate those recommendations in this provision. The decision to limit changes to those requested by the Department of Defense is not made with prejudice to the suggestions offered by GAO and CBO. The committee did not have sufficient time to evaluate fully those suggestions.

The committee believes that the Selected Acquisition Reports are valuable reports for purposes of congressional oversight and has included changes in SAR reporting requirements to improve the utility of the reports to the Congress.

COUNTERINTELLIGENCE POLYGRAPH PROGRAM

Section 1221 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (Public Law 99-145) directs the implementation during fiscal years 1986 and 1987 of a test program of counterintelligence polygraph examinations for military and civilian personnel of the Department of Defense and personnel of contractors of the Department whose duties involve access to classified information at the level of top secret or classified information within special access programs. The total number of polygraph examinations to be conducted under the program was limited to 3,500 during fiscal year 1986 and 7,000 during fiscal year 1987.

Subsection (e) of section 1221 provides generally, that the section does not apply to persons assigned or detailed to or under contract with the Central Intelligence Agency, to persons employed by, assigned or detailed to or under contract with the National Security Agency, to persons employed by a contractor of the National Security Agency, to persons applying for a position with the National Security Agency, or to persons assigned to a space where sensitive cryptologic information is handled.

The committee has learned that some doubt continues to exist about whether a program utilizing counterintelligence polygraphs, which is under the purview of the Director of Central Intelligence but for which the Department of Defense conducts the examinations, is covered by Section 1221 or by the exclusions in subsection (e) of that section. The Secretary of Defense authorized the use of polygraphs in this program in August, 1982.

The committee exempted this program for fiscal year 1986 as part of the Supplemental Authorization Act and the Department of Defense requested that that exemption be continued for fiscal year 1987. The committee agrees that the program is a very important one and that the exemption should be continued. Therefore, the committee has included a provision which will exclude this one specific program from computation of the total polygraphs conducted under the program authorized by Section 1221 of the 1986 Authorization Act. However, in order to prevent unwarranted growth, the committee provided that the number of examinations conducted under this program in fiscal year 1987 shall not exceed the number conducted in fiscal year 1986.

The committee has been informed that the exemption in current law in subsection (e) of Section 1221 which exempts persons assigned to a space where sensitive "cryptologic information" is handed should be changed to "cryptographic information."

Cryptologic or "cryptology" is a branch of knowledge concerned with signal intelligence or communications security. It embraces means and methods of establishing and maintaining communications security and producing signal intelligence.

Cryptographic or "cryptography" is a branch of cryptology describing means of encryption of plain text to conceal its meaning from all except the intended recipient, and decryption of cipher text based on knowledge of the system or key employed in the encryption. Possession of cryptographic information and materials can reveal classified and sensitive information on almost every conceivable subject related to the U.S. Government's operations and plans. Within the Department of Defense, far fewer people have access to cryptographic material than to cryptologic material.

Changing the term "cryptologic" to "cryptographic" brings the section into conformance with the committee's original intention that this exemption apply narrowly to those individuals who actually handle codes and ciphers. The committee has been assured that the Department has, despite the current language, limited this exemption to persons with access to cryptographic information.

PURCHASES OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES FOR RESALE

Conferees on the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986, considered and rejected a House provision which would have mandated that the Department of Defense (including nonappropriated fund activities) purchase all alcoholic beverages destined for resale on military installations from sources within the State where the installation where the beverages were to be sold is located. The conference report on that bill was approved by the Congress and enacted on November 8, 1985.

Six weeks later, a provision in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1986, mandated just such a requirement.

The committee continues to object to such a requirement and has included a provision mandating that purchases of such alcoholic beverages for resale be made in the most efficient and economic manner, without regard to the location of the source of the beverages, except as that location may affect cost. The committee rejects the suggestion that a within-State requirement is necessary to make the armed forces "good neighbors" with the civilian communities near which they are located. Rather the committee believes that procurement of alcoholic beverage for resale should be subjected to the same favorable effects of competition as is useful in the procurement of other goods and services. Additionally, the committee does not believe it appropriate to impose upon the Department, or the morale and welfare activities of the Department a requirement which will result in additional costs of tens of millions of dollars, caused by the imposition of indirect State taxation in the Federal government and the lack of competition.

MODERNIZATION OF NATO'S SOUTHERN FLANK

The committee recognizes that the widespread obsolescence of the forces of Greece, Portugal, and Turkey has serious consequences for the overall defense of NATO, and realizes that substantial levels of security assistance are essential to overcome these deficiencies. Given the anticipated drastic decreases in the U.S. security assistance upon which these southern flank allies depend to modernize their military forces, the committee feels that action should be taken to provide additional modernization assistance to these allies.

Therefore, the committee has included a provision granting the President the authority to transfer excess equipment from Department of Defense stocks, at no cost, to those member nations of NATO's southern flank which are eligible for U.S. security assistance and are integrated into NATO's military structure, for the purpose of helping to modernize the defense capabilities of these nations. Prior notification is required for each proposed transfer including a certification of need and an assessment of the impact of the transfer on the U.S. Armed Forces. It is the committee's intent that equipment be transferred which is dated by our standards, but which could still make a military contribution to the defense of NATO's southern flank.

In granting this authorization, the committee intends that:

1) the equipment to be transferred be that which is excess to the requirements of U.S. active duty forces, or programmed to be excess;

2) the security assistance eligibility in the legislation be limited to those countries which are eligible for Foreign Military Sales credits and/or participation in the Military Assistance Program; and

3) the President grant such equipment on the basis of the military requirements of the southern flank nations and the contribution such transfers will make to the defense of the southern flank of NATO.

The committee understands that, at the present time, this amendment would only authorize the transfer of equipment to Greece, Portugal, and Turkey.

COOPERATIVE LOGISTICS ARRANGEMENTS IN NATO

Last year the Congress made clear its commitment to facilitating cooperation in research and development and production of common weapons systems within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). However, the legislative authority is lacking to extend such cooperation to logistical support of weapon systems fielded in common by both the United States and her NATO partners.

Department of Defense policy is to encourage cooperative logistics projects, especially via the NATO Maintenance and Supply Agency (NAMSA), the logistic support agency within NATO. However, current legislative authority for U.S. participation in NAMSA Weapon System Partnerships is not well defined. Current legislative authority (normal Foreign Military Sales (FMS) procedures) is cumbersome and costly. Thus, the Military Departments are reluctant to utilize NAMSA for logistic support services in Europe. The result is that a single weapon system (e.g., HAWK, LANCE, TOW) fielded by both the United States and our NATO allies has duplicative and redundant logistics support systems in Europe: a U.S.-only system and a cooperative NAMSA system used by her allies.

The administration has requested legislation authorizing the Secretary of Defense to enter into NAMSA Weapon System Partnerships for the cooperative logistics support of weapon systems fielded in Europe by the United States and one or more NATO allies. Each partnership would be jointly managed by the participating nations, and administrative costs would be equitably shared among them. In carrying out the terms of a Partnership, the Secretary of Defense could (1) agree that NAMSA can contract for U.S. requirements using procedures agreed to by all participating NATO nations, and (2) make advance payments for facilities and stocks if required.

In the committee's view the benefits of the proposal include: (1) allowing the United States to save money by consolidated quantity buys, centralization, and one-time facilitization costs; (2) promoting rationalization, standardization, and interoperability; (3) sending a positive "two-way street" signal to our allies; and (4) reducing pressure on U.S. troop strength ceilings in Europe by using NAMSA manpower to perform support functions currently performed by U.S. troops. Therefore, the committee recommends approval of this proposal.

COOPERATIVE PROJECTS

Section 1102 of the 1986 Department of Defense Authorization Act authorized the President to enter into agreements with other members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) for cooperative armaments projects. Such projects are to be jointly managed, described in written agreements and undertaken to further alliance rationalization, standardization and interoperability. To carry out such projects, the Secretary of Defense is permitted on a case-by-case basis, subject to certain reporting requirements, to require subcontracts to be awarded to particular subcontractors and to waive certain laws prescribing contract procedures and U.S. preference requirements.

The committee believes that Section 1102 provides an important new tool for the United States to pursue collaboration on conventional defense improvements with our NATO and non-NATO allies. The committee is of the view that further improvements in conventional defense could be achieved by increasing the number of friendly countries with which the United States can cooperate, to include, among others, Australia, Israel, Japan, and the Republic of Korea.

Therefore, the committee recommends for approval a proposal that Section 1102 be extended to other friendly countries.

ACQUISITION AND CROSS-SERVICE AGREEMENTS

Last year the administration forwarded to the Congress proposed legislation to amend the NATO Mutual Support Act (P.L. 96-323, 10 U.S.C. 2341 et.seq.) to allow the exchange of logistic support, supplies, and services with the armed forces of the Republic of Korea as well as North Atlantic Treaty Organization countries. Congress, however, did not act on the proposal at that time.

The NATO Mutual Support Act was enacted to remedy certain difficulties that the United States encountered in exchanging logistic support, supplies, and services with her NATO allies. The NATO Mutual Support Act does two principal things:

—Facilitate acquisition by the United States from NATO allies of host nation logistical support and services (rations, billeting, transportation, base support, etc.) by waiving certain provisions of U.S. domestic procurement law.

—Enable the United States to provide similar services and supplies to NATO nations through cross-servicing agreements without having to treat each transaction as a foreign military sales case under the Arms Export Control Act.

The effect of the legislation has been to enhance the readiness and the rationalization, standardization, and interoperability of NATO forces.

During hearings held by the committee in review of the fiscal year 1987 Department of Defense Authorization Bill, both Admiral Hays, Commander in Chief, U.S. Pacific Command and General Crist, Commander in Chief, U.S. Central Command expressed support for the concept of extending the NATO Mutual Support Act to other friends and allies within their Command. Additionally, Secretary Weinberger has indicated his support for the idea of extending the NATO Mutual Support Act beyond NATO and the Republic of Korea.

Therefore, the committee recommends approval of a proposal to extend the terms of the NATO Mutual Support Act to countries with which the United States has defense alliances or conducts joint exercises, or which allow the stationing or positioning of United States forces or materiel. It would authorize the Secretary of Defense to enter into agreements with specified countries to permit the Department of Defense to acquire host nation logistic support for U.S. forces deployed overseas. In addition, U.S. forces could enter into cross-servicing agreements with designated countries for reciprocal logistic support in overseas areas and logistic support to foreign forces stationed or training in North America. This would enhance U.S. readiness at minimal cost by making it possible for U.S. forces to make use of existing host nation logistic capabilities. It would increase the effectiveness of combined military operations by allowing each country's forces to support the other's when necessary and by allowing them to practice mutual support procedures during combined exercises.

The proposal would permit the conclusion of cross-servicing agreements only on the basis of full reciprocity; U.S. forces would be assured of receiving as much support as they provide. Furthermore, the proposal would not be used for the transfer of major defense end items. The security assistance program would continue to be the primary means of U.S. support to foreign military forces pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act.

COOPERATIVE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT WITH NON-NATO ALLIES AND OTHER FRIENDLY COUNTRIES

Last year, the Senate proposed, and the Congress enacted into law, a program to promote greater cooperation in armaments research and development between the United States and its NATO allies. This initiative has led to substantial interest among our NATO allies in greater cooperation in defense research and development. As a result, it has been suggested that greater cooperation with selected non-NATO countries could also be beneficial. The committee recognizes that the benefits from U.S. collaboration in defense with non-NATO countries may be more limited than for collaboration with NATO, but the committee believes that several non-NATO countries have substantial technical capabilities in selected areas of defense technology. Accordingly, the committee recommends that the DOD have authority to engage in collaborative defense research and development projects with other non-NATO countries but on a lesser scale than for the NATO Cooperative Research and Development Program.

The committee recommends approval of a provision which provides that the participants shall share the costs of a cooperative project on an equitable basis. The committee intends this language to assure that each country will contribute its fair share of the costs of the project, in part determined by the expected return to the country involved. The committee does not intend this language to require that each country should bear an equal share of the costs associated with a project.

ARMS CONTROL PROVISIONS

The committee approved two "sense of the Senate" provisions relating to compliance with existing arms control agreements.

One states that it is in the national security interests of the United States to continue voluntary compliance with existing strategic offensive arms agreements by recognizing the central numerical sublimits on strategic nuclear delivery systems in the SALT II agreement, so long as the Soviet Union remains within those sublimits.

The second provision states that consistent with international law, it is not in the national interest of the United States to comply with strategic arms agreements that the Soviet Union has clearly violated.

FEDERALLY FUNDED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER FOR THE STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE

The administration has stated the need for a technical support organization to augment the existing capabilities of the Strategic Defense Initiative Organization (SDIO). A number of alternatives have been considered to provide such support, including establishing a new Federally Funded Research and Development Center (FFRDC), establishing a new division within an existing FFRDC or using an existing FFRDC, contracting with a university or other non-profit institution other than an FFRDC, contracting with a for-profit organization, or providing the support within an existing or new Department of Defense organization. The administration has concluded that establishment of a new FFRDC is the preferred solution.

While the committee has not had an opportunity to assess the most appropriate means to provide technical support to the SDIO, the committee does recognize the need for such support in carrying out the system tradeoffs and system integration efforts required to manage a program as complex as the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). Therefore, the committee endorses the establishment of a mechanism to provide this technical support, such as was provided to the Air Force ICBM development effort by the Aerospace Corporation. The committee does not endorse the establishment of an entity to provide policy analysis or to provide studies and analyses separate from that required to perform a technical support function.

Because the committee has not had an opportunity to review the administration's assessment of the preferred means to provide technical support, and because a number of valid questions need to be answered with regard to the establishment of a new FFRDC for this purpose, the committee recommends legislative language that precludes the obligation of funds for a new FFRDC until 30 legislative days after receipt of a report from the Department of Defense.

Following receipt of this report, and a separate report from the General Accounting Office, the committee will schedule a hearing to consider all the issues relative to providing technical support to the SDIO, and will thereafter, if appropriate, make a recommendation to the Senate with regard to continuation of the funding limitation contained in this bill.

SPECIAL DEFENSE ACQUISITION FUND

The Special Defense Acquisition Fund (SDAF) was established by the International Security and Development Cooperation Act, 1981 to finance the acquisition of defense articles and services in anticipation of their sale to eligible foreign countries and international organizations. The purpose of the SDAF is to reduce the delivery time of U.S. arms sales to foreign purchasers and to reduce the adverse impact of U.S. foreign arms sales on U.S. readiness and inventory levels.

The funding ceiling for the SDAF was established in Title 10, Section 138, United States Code and was increased to $1 billion in 1986. The SDAF does not utilize appropriated funds but rather is capitalized—through time—by:

—Foreign Military Sales (FMS) from DOD stocks of defense articles not intended to be replaced;

—Asset use charges and charges for the proportionate recoupment of nonrecurring research, development, and production costs; and

—FMS sales or reimbursements due to grant aid transfer of defense articles and services acquired with SDAF funds.

Collections into the SDAF from the authorized sources total $993 million. The administration has requested a $100 million increase in total SDAF capitalization raising the ceiling to $1.1 billion. This money is needed to purchase increased quantities of ammunition, missiles, radios, infantry weapons, and combat vehicles.

The committee attaches substantial importance to the SDAF and recommends that this request be approved.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE TO TRANSPORT HUMANITARIAN RELIEF SUPPLIES

In 1984, the Congress enacted Section 1540 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1985 (Public Law 98–525, 98 Stat 2637) to provide authority for the Secretary of Defense in fiscal year 1985 to transport on a space available basis, at no charge, to any country in Central America, goods and supplies that have been provided by a non-governmental source and which are intended for humanitarian assistance. In 1985, the Congress, in Section 306 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (Public Law 99–145, 99 Stat 617), extended that authority for fiscal year 1986, and extended it to the rest of the world.

The administration has defined and implemented regulations to implement the provision. As of the end of April 1986, twenty-two applications had been acted on during fiscal year 1986, including thirteen still pending from 1985. Action had been completed on six, four were partially shipped, three were awaiting shipment, seven required additional processing, and two were voided by the prospective donor. To date, most of the shipments have been to Latin America.

The committee commends the Departments of State and Defense for their efforts in implementing a valuable program, and recommends extension of the authority for fiscal year 1987.

HUMANITARIAN AND CIVIC ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES

The administration submitted a legislative proposal to clarify the authority of the U.S. Armed Forces to engage in humanitarian and civic assistance activities undertaken in conjunction with authorized military operations conducted in friendly countries. Current law (Section 8072, 1986 Department of Defense Appropriations Act) authorizes the use of operations and maintenance funds for humanitarian and civic assistance costs incurred incidental to authorized operations. Although the statutory language authorizes humanitarian and civic action activities incidental to "authorized operations", the legislative history of the provision has been interpreted to limit the activities to those incidental to JCS-directed or coordinated exercises overseas. The General Accounting Office has recommended that this authority be legislatively clarified because of its concern that the scope of current Defense Department activities may exceed the authority that Congress intended to confer in Section 8072.

The committee believes that the provision of humanitarian and civic assistance activities to the civilian populace of developing foreign countries potentially confronted with low intensity conflict should be explicitly recognized as a valid military mission. The committee noted that the Unified Commanders fully supported this request. General Galvin, Commander-in-Chief, U.S. Southern Command, noted that these activities not only provide excellent training to U.S. forces, but also develop a broad base of community support.

Therefore, the committee recommends approval of a proposal to authorize the Secretary of a military department to carry out humanitarian and civic assistance activities in conjunction with authorized military operations of U.S. armed forces in foreign countries in which it is determined that the activities will promote (1) both U.S. security interests and the security interests of the country in which the activities are to be carried out; and (2) operational readiness skills of U.S. armed forces.

The committee is of the view that the intended beneficiaries of assistance provided under the authority of this chapter should be the civilian, non-combatant population of a country. Therefore, it included a provision prohibiting any assistance, provided under this chapter, directly or indirectly, to any individual, group, or organization engaged in military or paramilitary activity. The committee recognizes that the organized armed forces of the countries in which activities under this section will be conducted will often cooperate with U.S. Armed Forces. The committee believes that such cooperation will often be critical to the achievement of exercise objectives and does not intend that this language be construed to limit such U.S.-host country cooperation.

AUTHORITY TO PAY OR DEFRAY INCREMENTAL EXPENSES FOR FOREIGN COUNTRY PARTICIPATION IN COMBINED EXERCISES

The Department of Defense requested legislation authorizing the Secretary of Defense to expend Department of Defense appropriations to pay or defray the incremental costs including transportation, subsistence, materiel and other exercise costs incurred by a developing country as a direct result of its participation, at the request of the United States, in a combined exercise.

The committee recognizes the valuable contribution that combined exercises can make to U.S. foreign and defense policies and encourages combined exercises wherever possible. However, the committee also recognizes that many developing foreign countries cannot afford the cost of participation in these exercises. Therefore, the committee agreed that the Secretary of Defense should be given authority to pay these costs in certain circumstances.

The provision adopted by the committee permits the Secretary of Defense to pay incremental expenses if: (1) the primary purpose of the exercise is to enhance the security interests to the United States; and (2) the Secretary of Defense determines that the participation by a foreign country is necessary to the achievement of the exercises objectives and that, unless the United States provides the incremental expenses incurred by that country, the objectives cannot be achieved.

The committee also adopted a definition of the term incremental expenses limiting them to items which would be consumed by the foreign country in the course of the exercise, including, but not limited to, rations, training ammunition, fuel and transportation. The committee recognizes that the use of U.S. funds to provide these items to a foreign government would ordinarily fall within the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751, et. seq). In adopting this provision, the committee does not intend to create authority to permit substantial amounts of defense items to be provided to foreign countries under the rubric of "incremental expenses" which would otherwise be subject to the Arms Export Control Act. Rather, the committee intends to provide narrow authority to the Secretary of Defense to assist in the payment of those reasonable and proper expenses incurred by a foreign government which directly relate to that government's participation in a combined exercise and which would not have been incurred but for their participation in the combined exercises. The committee also adopted a provision requiring the Secretary of Defense to establish accounting procedures to ensure that the funds are properly expended and to report to Congress not later than March 1 of each year containing a list of the countries for which expenses have been paid and the amounts.

The Department of Defense has estimated that this program will cost $1.6 million in fiscal year 1987 and $13.4 million for fiscal years 1987-1991. The amount has been included in the Defense wide contingency account.

PAYMENT OF CERTAIN EXPENSES OF FOREIGN DEFENSE PERSONNEL

The administration submitted a legislative proposal to authorize the payment by the Department of Defense of travel, subsistence, and other similar personal expenses of defense personnel of developing foreign countries whose participation in bilateral or regional cooperation programs is in the national security interests of the United States. This authority currently exists for defense personnel only from Latin America.

The authority is limited to the payment of expenses on behalf of personnel from a developing country only in connection with travel within the area of responsibility of the unified command in which the developing country is located. In those cases in which the headquarters of the unified command is located in the United States (U.S. Atlantic Command, U.S. Central Command) expenses may be paid for travel to the United States.

The committee recommends approval of this proposal with one addition to the administration's request. The committee, concerned about recent reports of the payment by the Defense Department of excessive and extraordinary expenses incurred by visiting foreign officials, adopted a provision which provides that expenses paid may not exceed the amount that would be paid under chapter 7 of title 37, United States Code, to a member of the U.S. armed forces (of a comparable grade) for similar travel.

REPORT ON DOD PARTICIPATION IN U.S. DRUG INTERDICTION EFFORTS

In recent years, the Congress has directed increased Department of Defense involvement in efforts to stem the flow of illegal drugs into the U.S. Unfortunately, rather than developing an overall policy for DOD participation, the Congress has tended instead to micromanage procurement and force structure decisions in an effort to expand DOD involvement. The committee believes this approach is counterproductive.

Therefore, the committee directs the National Drug Enforcement Policy Board to report to the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services not later than December 1, 1986, its recommendations for the role of the Defense Department in U.S. drug enforcement policy. This report shall include a five year funding plan for Department of Defense participation. The committee believes that the National Drug Enforcement Policy Board is in the best position to evaluate the assets that can be provided by all agencies involved in U.S. drug enforcement policy and determine how those assets should be utilized to support U.S. policy.

REPORTING OF TERRORIST THREATS

Timely notice of potential terrorist activity can reduce the risk to United States citizens and property.

The committee has included a bill provision directing the Secretary of Defense to instruct authorities that credible, time-sensitive intelligence concerning potential terrorist threats will be reported to concerned headquarters by the most appropriate and expeditious means available.

BUDGET-RELATED MATTERS

BUDGETING FOR INFLATION

The Department of Defense has been criticized during the past year for the manner in which it budgets funds to cover anticipated inflation. In recent years, funds included in the defense budget to compensate for inflation have been excess to the amounts required to fund actual inflation increases. The Department of Defense acknowledged that $28.4 billion of excess inflation funding had been provided since 1982. Estimates by the Congressional Budget Office and the General Accounting Office differ somewhat, but also conclude that excess funds have been provided in recent years.

The committee believes that most or all of these funds have already been used, and that no major inflation "dividend" remains in DOD accounts. A substantial portion of these excess funds were transferred by the Congress or by the Department of Defense under established reprogramming procedures to support valid defense requirements, as well as to reduce the new budget authority required in 1985 and 1986.

A primary factor contributing to overestimates of inflation funding was the Department's practice of adding 30 percent to its inflation forecast when projecting prices of major weapon systems. In preparing the 1987 request, however, the Department returned to the use of a general inflation rate projection for these systems. The committee agrees that, in the current economic climate, no special inflation rate for weapons systems is necessary, but recognizes that major system prices have deviated from general price trends at times. The committee believes that the principle of a major systems price differential is important to retain, in the event that the decline in inflation rates should reverse in future years.

More broadly, suggestions have been offered for fundamentally restructuring the manner in which the Department of Defense budgets funds for inflation. The most far reaching suggestion is for inflation funds to be provided retroactively, through supplemental appropriations.

At the request of the committee, the Congressional Budget Office analyzed the defense inflation issue and examined alternative procedures for budgeting for inflation. The committee strongly agrees with one of the main conclusions of the CBO report: no method of forecasting inflation is perfect. There will always be errors, and therefore, it is improper to criticize the Defense Department for not being perfect. Also, it is inappropriate to revise current procedures simply because there were forecasting errors.

The committee believes that at present, proposals for revising Defense Department budgeting procedures for inflation is a solution in search of a problem. Because of the controversy accompanying the inflation issue, however, the committee believes it is important to state explicitly the principles which will guide the committee in considering any revision of the procedures for budgeting for inflation.

First, the committee reaffirms its commitment to full funding of defense programs. Full funding is essential to maintain the fiscal integrity of the authorizing and appropriating process. Full funding requires that projected inflation costs be incorporated in any authorization and appropriation of funds.

Second, any revised system for budgeting for inflation should be neutral in terms of making adjustments for revised inflation assumptions or actual inflation experience. That is, any new system should be just as useful for adding funds to cover underestimates of inflation as it is in removing excess funds when inflation is overfunded. Many of the suggestions for revised budgeting procedures are biased toward removing excess inflation funds and against adding funds when inflation was underestimated.

Third, any revised system has to be manageable. The current accounting system is already too complex, and the Congress is already too preoccupied with accounting inputs. Any new system must strike a balance between flexibility in the Defense Department and acceptable oversight by Congress.

Fourth, any change in budgeting for inflation has to be workable for two year budgets. Next year, the Department of Defense will submit a biennial budget request for the fiscal year 1988–1989 biennium.

The committee does not direct any action on this issue at this time. However, the committee requests the Secretary of Defense to evaluate the application of an inflation fund, patterned after the Foreign Currency Fluctuation Fund, for incorporation in the fiscal year 1988–1989 biennial budget submission.

TWO-YEAR BUDGETS

In order to more coherently establish national defense priorities and allocate defense resources in concert with those priorities, last year the Congress directed in law that the President submit a two-year budget for the Department of Defense beginning in fiscal year 1988. For the first time in fiscal year 1988, the Senate Armed Services Committee will deal with a biennial budget covering the 1988–1989 biennium.

Section 1405 of Public Law 99-145 required the Secretary of Defense to report to Congress any statutory changes which may be required to implement biennial budgeting. The Secretary of Defense reported that no statutory changes will be required to convert to a two-year budget.

Implementing a biennial budget will help Congress move away from detailed annual budget reviews and should provide more time for broad policy oversight. Biennial budgeting is a key step to improving congressional oversight in ways that reinforce the reforms incorporated in the DOD reorganization bill passed earlier this year by the Senate.

By shifting to a biennial process, both the Congress and the Department of Defense can take a longer term view of budgetary commitments and the effect these commitments may have on future funding resources and policy decisions. Continuity and stability are added benefits of a longer term focus. Instead of day-to-day budgeting, plans can be made and executed with minor adjustment and oversight in the off years.

Such a conversion would not be without certain problems. There are two major problems that must be resolved if biennial budgeting is to be successful. The first concerns the inherent uncertainty of economic forecasting. Congress will now have to consider estimates of economic conditions as far as 30 months in the future. The longer period involved in the biennial period will make economic forecasting even less accurate than in an annual process. Congress and the Defense Department will need to develop methods for adjusting to changing economic conditions without undermining the viability of the two-year budget process.

The committee believes there are at least three primary means to accommodate the inherent uncertainty of economic assumptions in two-year budgets. First, the Department could budget for an extra margin of inflation funding protection for the second year of the budget, which could be removed mechanically should inflation not exceed forecasted rates. The second approach would be to permit a strictly limited budget amendment at the start of the second year which would encompass only changes in economic conditions. A third approach would be to set up a special fund to compensate for errors in economic forecasting. If actual inflation proved to be lower than expected, excess funds could be transferred from programs and would accumulate in the fund. Accumulated balances could then be used to offset budget shortages in years when inflation was under-estimated.

Each of these approaches has advantages and disadvantages. The committee will continue to work with the Comptroller of the Department of Defense to examine alternatives to facilitate shifting to biennial budgets and will incorporate in the fiscal year 1988-1989 defense authorization bill recommendations for managing economic forecasting in the biennial budget process.

The second major problem concerns the need to review new programs in the middle of a biennium which were not anticipated in the budget request for that two-year period. While the Department requested no change in current reprogramming procedures, the committee is convinced that some changes may be required.

A strong commitment is required by both the Congress and the Executive Branch in order to realize the benefits of the biennial process. The Senate Armed Services Committee fully intends to implement a two-year budget for the fiscal year 1988–1989 period and to continue to work with the Department of Defense to make any adjustment to current practices which may be necessary.

The committee also notes that Section 1405 of P.L. 99-145 directed biennial budgeting for the Department of Defense and related agencies. The committee expects all agencies with funds incorporated in National Defense Budget Function 050 to incorporate all relevant elements of those agency budgets in the 1988–1989 biennial budget submission.

Intelligence-Related Matters

COMMUNICATIONS SECURITY

The committee is concerned that domestic communications are vulnerable to intercept by hostile intelligence services. The National Security Agency has developed a plan to encrypt selected domestic communications circuits.

The committee recommends authorization of $129,000,000 for the Department of Defense to begin prompt implementation of this plan and for related communications security enhancements which are detailed in the classified annex to the Intelligence Committee's report on the Intelligence Authorization bill for fiscal year 1987.

IMPROVED DOD SECURITY/STILWELL COMMISSION

The Stilwell Commission Report on DOD Security Policies and Practices, submitted to the Secretary of Defense on November 19, 1985, proposed substantial improvements in personnel and industrial security to reduce the likelihood of espionage in the military services and defense agencies. The Stilwell Commission recommendations include expanding the scope of Defense Investigative Service (DIS) background investigations for Secret clearances; improving collection and processing of state and local criminal history data for security clearances; improving DIS safeguards involving interim Top Secret clearances; expanding and relocating the Defense Security Institute for improved training; and increasing OSD staff for oversight of Defense Department personnel security programs.

The committee recommends authorization of $22,290,000 to accelerate implementation of the Stilwell Commission recommendations described.

The committee also recommends authorization of $469,000 for improvement of Air Force technical security surveys and inspections.

The committee recommendations for funding implementation of the Stilwell Commission recommendations and for technical security, and for communications security discussed previously, total $151,759,000 above the administration's request.

Cooperation With NATO Allies

The committee reviewed four procurement issues in the Sea Power and Force Projection area in tandem because they all relate to cooperative efforts with our NATO allies. Each is discussed in detail elsewhere in this report.

The committee decided to terminate the Navy program to install Norwegian-designed Penguin missiles on SH-60 helicopters, and to terminate further development of the joint U.S.-Federal Republic of Germany program to build a new point defense missile system, known as the Rolling Airframe Missile. The committee also authorized the Navy to purchase two existing minesweeper hunter ships from a shipbuilder in an allied country. Finally, the committee authorized the Department of Defense to proceed with a classified program which is discussed in detail in the classified annex.

Each issue was reviewed on its military and programmatic merits, independent of any connection with European allies. All four were also discussed in the context of our security relations with important and valued allies in the common defense. Ultimately, because the Armed Services Committee is responsible for military affairs and not foreign policy matters, military considerations were predominant in the committee's decisions on these four items.

The committee remains strongly committed to rational collaboration with U.S. allies in development and procurement of weapon systems. But collaboration is not sufficient, in and of itself, to justify proceeding with programs of questionable military merit.

The committee is also convinced that collaborative efforts with NATO allies offer the greatest promise when those efforts are focused on programs in the earliest stages of development. For this reason, the committee strongly endorses and approves as requested funds for NATO Cooperative Research and Development programs in the Research and Development accounts of the Army, Navy, Air Force and Defense Agencies. The committee commends the Department of Defense for its aggressive efforts in pursuit of cooperative projects with U.S. allies, and further recognizes the important contributions by the U.S. Ambassador to NATO to promote these cooperative projects. Because the committee attaches such importance to greater transatlantic armaments cooperation under this program, the Department is directed not to apply any undistributed reductions against these accounts.

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION

PURPOSE OF DIVISION B

The purpose of Division B is to provide military construction authorization and related authority in support of the military departments during fiscal year 1987. The administration's request is reflected in S. 2132 as introduced by request. This division, as approved by the Committee on Armed Services, totals $8,803,028,000 in authorization for appropriation. It provides construction in support of the Military Services, Guard and Reserve components, Defense Agencies, NATO Infrastructure, and includes military family housing requirements. Committee review resulted in a net reduction of $1,184,110,000 from the total $9,987,138,000 initially requested in authorization for appropriation for fiscal year 1987.

A brief summary of the authorizations provided in Division B follows:

Authorization for Appropriations Granted, Fiscal Year 1987

Title I (Army):	
Inside the United States	742,500,000
Outside the United States	418,800,000
Minor construction	99,070,000
Planning and design	131,640,000
Family housing construction	387,330,000
Family housing suppport	1,265,266,000
Homeowners assistance	6,000,000
Subtotal	3,050,606,000
Title II (Navy):	
Inside the United States	1,128,045,000
Outside the United States	107,670,000
Minor construction	114,375,000
Planning and design	143,770,000
Defense access roads	5,400,000
Family housing construction	176,992,000
Family housing suppport	560,591,000
Subtotal	2,236,843,000
Title III (Air Force):	
Inside the United States	670,057,000
Outside the United States	327,143,000
Minor construction	218,320,000
Planning and design	127,260,000
Defense access roads	32,700,000
Family housing construction	103,000,000
Family housing suppport	751,409,000
Subtotal	2,229,889,000
Title IV (Defense Agencies):	
Inside the United States	315,510,000
Outside the United States	100,330,000
Minor construction	31,950,000
Contingency construction	5,000,000
Conforming storage facilities	16,400,000
Planning and design	100,700,000
Family housing construction	270,000
Family housing suppport	17,330,000
Subtotal	587,490,000
Title V (NATO Infrastructure)	247,000,000
Title VI (Guard and Reserve):	
Army National Guard	121,100,000
Army Reserve	86,700,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve	44,500,000
Air National Guard	140,000,000
Air Force Reserve	58,900,000
Subtotal	451,200,000
Total authorization of appropriations	8,803,028,000

BACKGROUND

Military construction requirements for fiscal year 1987 identified in this legislation were developed on the same basis as the Department of Defense request presented to Congress for military procurement. This concept involves the so-called package-program method of identifying our military forces with their primary missions and then assigning to these forces the weapons,equipment, and facilities necessary to discharge effectively these assigned mission responsibilities.

The Department of Defense requested authorization for appropriations in the amount of $9,987,138,000 for fiscal year 1987 - slightly less than 4 percent below the $10,309,471,000 requested for fiscal year 1986 by the administration but more than 8.6 percent higher than the $9,199,824,000 authorized for appropriations for FY 1986. One quarter of the FY 1987 request is for operation and maintenance of military family housing and the rest, $7.4 billion, was requested for new construction, including $570 million for planning and design. Construction in the United States accounts for 73 percent, with 20 percent for bases in Europe, and 7 percent in other areas overseas.

The committee assessed each proposal and project to assure that only those items which are essential to our national defense interests would be approved.

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ACTION

The fiscal year 1987 military construction authorization bill was introduced as S. 2132 and hearings were conducted by the Subcommittee on Military Construction of the Committee on Armed Services. The subcommittee met on numerous occasions to thoroughly review more than 2,000 individual construction projects at over 700 military installations within the United States and overseas.

AREAS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

The committee has been able to support the request of the Department of Defense for increases in the military construction budget in support of new weapons systems, modernization of the workplace, and quality of life for our servicemen and women and their families.

This year the Congress is faced with the difficult task of reconciling the need for military construction and family housing with the need to reduce the Nation's unacceptably high budget deficit. In the face of this dilemma, the committee agreed that reductions in budget authority of $1.2 billion be made in the military construction request.

The committee recommended funding for facilities associated with our strategic modernization. It supported troop and family housing. Funds were recommended for the new Navy bases at Staten Island, New York and Everett, Washington as well as the continuation of the light infantry division at Fort Drum, New York and initial construction for the stationing of the light infantry division in Alaska. Funds were not recommended for projects with insufficient justification. Due to severe budget constraints, the committee recommended deferral of many projects that would have improved the quality and efficiency of our military bases.

To avoid micromanagement, the committee recommended raising the threshold for minor military construction to $2 million. It recommended authorization for minor construction on a lump sum basis rather than by line item.

The committee recommended repeal of legislation that prohibited U.S. installations in Europe from converting from U.S. coal to alternative energy sources even where it would have been cost effective.

The committee recommended establishment of a Presidential Commission to develop base closure recommendations since the Department of Defense has taken no action to date.

COMPOSITE AUTHORIZATIONS

The services in several instances combined individual project requests into a single request for authorization. Examples include Army construction at Ft. Drum, New York for the 10th Infantry Division and strategic homeports at Naval Station, New York, New York and Naval Station, Everett, Washington. The committee combined individual projects into single authorization approvals for the following:

ARMY

Ft. Wainwright, AK/6th Infantry Division Facilities

NAVY

Naval Submarine Base, Kings Bay, GA/TRIDENT Support Complex

AIR FORCE

Malmstrom Air Force Base, MT/KC-135R Support Complex
McConnell Air Force Base, KS/B-1B Support Complex
Wurtsmith Air Force Base, MI/B-52 Support Complex
Grand Forks Air Force Base, ND/B-1B Support Complex
Minot Air Force Base, ND/CM-Support Complex

The committee encourages this approach toward simplifying the approval process. The committee further encourages multiyear single authorizations such as Ft. Drum which give the Congress an opportunity to review the whole project rather than a single year's increment.

MINOR CONSTRUCTION

The Department requested, and the committee supports, an increase in the Minor Construction threshold from $1,000,000 to $2,000,000 for projects authorized by 10 USC 2805.

The committee believes that in addition to increasing the threshold for Minor Construction projects, that the Department should exclude from the installation totals in Titles I, II, III, and IV, those projects costing less than $2,000,000. The totals of those projects are identified as a lump sum level of effort for Minor Construction authorization.

A list of the projects costing less than $2,000,000 is provided as part of the budget justification in support of the request for Minor Construction. The committee will indicate any problems that it has with these projects in the report language accompanying the bill.

Any changes the Department may wish to make to the list subsequent to authorization of the fiscal year program must be carried out in accordance with the new requirements identified in the revised Section 2805, title 10, United States Code.

This change will reduce the number of line items requiring specific congressional approval by about 56% (900 projects) while only affecting about 10 percent of the military construction funds requested. The committee feels that the reduction in line item approval will allow more time to review major construction projects while still serving the oversight requirements through the congressional notification and wait procedure.

For the purpose of authorized cost variations under 10 USC 2853, the approved project amount shall be deemed as the project amount listed by the Secretary as a part of his annual budget justification.

INSTALLATION MASTER PLANNING

This section would require each military department to submit with its fiscal year 1988 budget, installation master plans for at least two locations. Additionally, the request for authorization should include those construction projects (including family housing) contained in each of the plans for fiscal year 1988 through 1992.

Although the requested project authorization would cover a five year period, an installation master plan should cover a minimum period of ten years. Additionally, as a minimum, each plan should:

(1) List the assumptions made in developing the plan, to include military and civilian staffing assigned by fiscal year, mission statement and possible changes, weapon systems supported and possible changes, and other potential support requirement changes;

(2) Assign a numbered priority to each project, and when required to support a new weapon system, identify the weapon system as well as the planned initial operating capability date;

(3) Base the cost estimate for each project on current 1986 experience escalated to the appropriate fiscal year, and list the inflation and foreign currency exchange rates used by fiscal year to arrive at the final cost estimate listed;

(4) List all construction projects required regardless of the planned source of funds, and identify the Department of Defense appropriation (R&D, Family Housing, etc.), non-appropriated funds, host nation, NATO Infrastructure, or other source if other than the Military Construction Appropriations; and,

(5) Identify those facilities that will be acquired by leasing, or by executing long-term contracts with the private sector.

The committee's intent in testing this approach is to begin developing an improved alternative to the present process by which the Congress evaluates and decides funding questions on facilities that support the defense mission. If proved feasible, the result should be a more stable military construction program and topline funding within which a most effective base structure may be formulated to support attainment of national defense objectives.

BASE CLOSURE

As a part of the Department of Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1986, Congress streamlined the base closure process. However, the Department has not submitted its recommendations for base closure at the time of the annual budget submission as required by law, even though the department fully acknowledges that there are bases that should be closed. Therefore, the President is directed to establish a blue ribbon task group to develop a recommended list of base closure candidates for inclusion in the fiscal year 1989 defense budget request.

The commission would be established by the President with members jointly appointed by the President and the Majority and Minority Leaders of the Senate and the Speaker and Minority leader of the House of Representatives. None of the appointed members can be from the Congress of the United States. The commission would be required to submit its findings to the President and to the Congress.

PHILIPPINE BASES

The air and naval bases in the Philippines provide an essential strategic capability for the United States in East Asia and the Persian Gulf. The committee believes that it is in the best interest of the United States to have continued access to these bases. It is also clear that it would be very costly to relocate U.S. forces elsewhere in the Pacific.

The condition of the facilities at the air and naval bases are very poor, especially housing. Further capital investment of more than $600 million will be necessary in the next five years to correct these problems and meet mission requirements. Therefore, the committee has agreed to fund $73 million in fiscal year 1987 and encourages the Department to request sufficient funds in the next budget requests to address these problems.

SECTION 6 SCHOOLS

The committee has deferred funding in the amount of $17,380,000 for Section 6 schools in the United States.

Section 6 schools are dependent schools on military bases within the United States and its territories that are operated and maintained by the Secretary of Defense.

It is the objective of the Secretary of Defense to ultimately transfer these schools to local education districts whenever possible and the committee strongly agrees. In accordance with Section 824 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for 1986, the Department submitted their plan for the transfer of Section 6 schools to state control by July 1, 1990.

The General Accounting Office (GAO) has also been asked to report back to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives on this.

While the plan did not make specific recommendations by location, it did describe the following funding and operations alternatives:

1. Contract arrangements where the Federal Government finances some portion or all costs of students attending local schools.
2. Outright transfer of operational responsibility of schools. This may include transfer of ownership of facilities.

The committee believes that until active negotiations have commenced with local school districts and the states, construction requests should be deferred. No future request for construction funds will be approved unless it is part of a specific negotiated operation and funding option, or if the Secretary certifies that transfer for a particular school is not feasible.

CHILD CARE CENTERS

In accordance with the conference report on the fiscal year 1986 Military Construction Authorization Act (House Report 99-306), the Secretary of Defense was directed to evaluate the efforts of the Services to use third party financing to provide needed child care centers. In a report to the committee, the Secretary concluded that the private sector would be unable to provide preschool and infant care at fees affordable to lower ranking enlisted personnel, who most need the support.

The committee believes that adequate and safe child care services should be provided. The Department should continue to seek third party financing, home care and other approaches in lieu of government constructed centers to the maximum extent possible. However, where that is not feasible, the committee will approve child care centers funded from military construction appropriations.

THIRD PARTY CONTRACTING

Some progress has been made by the Department in utilizing third party contracting to provide capital intensive facilities that meet the need for essential services. The committee commends the Department for their very successful family housing project at Fort Ord using outleased land under the authority of 10 USC 2667. The project met a critical housing need without the requirement for the government to enter into a long-term financial commitment. The Air Force is contemplating a similar approach to acquire transient quarters at Bolling Air Force Base, Maryland and Wright Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio which may prove equally successful.

However, there are significant issues that the Department must deal with before third party financing will be a viable alternative to government funded construction:

1) Acquisition regulations must be tailored to third party contracting.
2) Risk and liability must be realistically shared between the government and the private sector.
3) Cost comparisons between government and private funded construction should reflect cost to the government not just to an individual service, including Federal taxes.

The Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1986 permitted the Department to enter into long-term facility contracts for the construction, management and operation of facilities for the provision of child care services, waste water treatment or depot supply activities. The committee is amending this provision to include potable water treatment, logistic (excluding depot maintenance) and administrative activities, troophousing and transient quarters. Further, to insure adequate congressional review, the Department will identify candidate projects as a part of the annual budget submission.

RESTRICTIONS ON CONVERSION OF HEATING FACILITIES AT UNITED STATES MILITARY INSTALLATIONS IN EUROPE

Over the past year the committee has been made aware of increasing Federal Republic of Germany's concerns about the environmental impact of U.S. defense facilities' continued use of coal at specific locations. In order to allow defense facilities in Europe to comply with the Status of Forces Agreement, maintain cordial relations between U.S. forces and local communities, and insure the most cost effective heating system is used, previous direction on the continued use of coal at those facilities has been modified. Specifically the department is permitted to vigorously pursue the following proposed district heating system connections in Germany:

Hanau (New Argoner and Argoner FH, Pioneer and Hutier Kas); Bamberg (Warner Bks III); Heidelberg (Schwetzingen); Heidelberg (Patrick Henry Village); Kornwestheim (Lundendorf KAS, Pattonville FH, Wilkins Bks); Frankfurt (Luebecker Strasse, Betts & FH, Drake-Edwards & FH); Stuttgart (Nellingen); Hanau (Fliergerhorst); Aschaffenburg; Giessen (Marshall Village); Hanau (Gelnhausen); Neu Elm; Stuttgart (Funker Kaserne); Mainz (Lee Bks, Sandflora FH, R&U area, Finthenlandstrasse FH, old Finthen housing); Idar-Oberstein (Neubrucke Hospital); Bad Kreuznach (Rose Barracks); Stuttgart (Echterdingen Airfield); Geissen (George Gershwin FH); Bad Hersfield (Fulda); Stuttgart (Patch FH); Karlsruhe (Gerzewski Bks); Mainz-Kastel (Weisbaden); Stuttgart (Wallace and McKee Bks); Baumholder (Smith Bks, OM and Hospital); Weiden (Camp Pitman); Nuernbert (Herzoganaurach); Frankfurt (Bad Vilbel); Nuernbert (Merril Bks, Hospital, Pastoriusstrausse FH); Hohenfels (Camp Nainhoff).

At the same time there is recognized a continuing need to ensure secure sources of domestic energy, such as coal, in support of national security and defense readiness interests. It is the direction of the Congress that the Department of Defense pursue a vigorous program to increase the use of U.S. coal at its CONUS facilities wherever cost-effective. This program should make maximum use of private venture capital, expertise and initiative through third party contracting to maximize the benefits to both private and public interests. The funds identified in Section 8110 of P.L. 99-190 shall continue to be available until expended to be used on a nonreimbursable basis for the administrative costs of this program.

IMPROVED FLEXIBILITY OF DEFENSE FACILITIES FUEL SELECTION

The committee believes that the new provision will allow the department greater flexibility in fuel selection while maintaining the general policies of lowest life cycle cost and long-term supply security. This modification will allow increased compliance with the spirit of the Competition in Contracting Act while providing improved mission support energy security and the ability to utilize the most cost-effective fuel source in the future of rapidly changing fuel costs. The Secretary of Defense is also directed to prescribe regulations for the determination of the life cycle cost-effectiveness of the fuel or fuels selected for facilities support.

MILITARY HOUSING BUILD TO LEASE (801) AND RENTAL GUARANTEE (802) PROGRAMS

The services have conducted numerous tests of these programs. The 801 program has led to 2,863 housing units under contract at six sites with current contract advertisements for 2,400 more units. Initial projects appeared to be too costly. However, recent changes in the discount rate and economic analyses have combined to yield projects of acceptable cost. The Navy is experimenting with a procedure to select the low bidder from the group of bidders in the competitive range of the fiscal year 1986 military construction housing program. Should that procedure prove successful, the committee expects this technique to be applied to all Department of Defense housing competitions including military construction, 801, and 802 programs. The 801 program has progressed to the point that an extension of the present pilot program is warranted; accordingly this year's authorization extends the program another two years and allows each service to construct up to 3,000 additional units.

The results of the 802 program have shown that the current guarantee does not offer developers sufficient incentive to build housing for the Department of Defense. The Navy 802 projects at Earle NJ and Longbeach CA, and the Air Force projects at Norton AFB CA and Goodfellow AFB TX, all resulted in no bids or one nonconforming bid. The Army awarded two contracts but both projects are experiencing financial problems. The 802 program has the potential to solve the defense housing shortages with a minimum amount of appropriated funds. The committee has included several changes to the 802 legislation to make it more attractive to private industry including: lengthening the allowable guarantee period from 15 to 25 years; permitting the entire rental amount (shelter as well as operations and maintenance) to escalate; and permitting construction to local codes and criteria. The program is being extended to 1990 to give the department sufficient time to fully evaluate the problems with the program and award contracts for the units authorized to date.

BRIGS

The Navy is to be commended for their study of their disciplinary system, especially with an increased emphasis on returning appropriate individuals to active duty. Such an approach has a high potential for significant savings. The committee believes that the conclusions reached from that study could be instructive throughout the Department of Defense. There may be Defense Department wide alternatives that would meet the confinement facility needs of all the Services. Therefore, the Secretary of Defense is directed to study this issue and report his findings to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The committee has approved the Navy's waterfront brigs, but deferred funding for the Navy consolidated brig facilities pending the Department's report.

TITLE I—ARMY

The Army requested authorization of $3,445,216,000. The committee, after careful review and consideration of the Army request, approved the following programs:

	Army request	Committee approved
Military construction:		
Inside the United States	$ 978,770,000	$ 742,500,000
Outside the United States	568,160,000	418,800,000
Design	131,640,000	131,640,000
Minor construction	20,000,000	99,070,000
Total, military construction	1,698,570,000	[1] 1,392,010,000
Military family housing:		
Construction, improvements, and design	463,380,000	387,330,000
Support	1,277,266,000	1,265,266,000
Total, family housing	1,740,646,000	1,652,596,000
Homeowner's assistance program	6,000,000	6,000,000
Grand total, Army	3,445,216,000	3,050,606,000

[1] All projects with a cost of $2 million or less are included in the category of minor construction.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

The Army's authorization request for military construction and family housing and the committee's recommendations are as follows:

MAJOR COMMAND SUMMARY

[In thousands of dollars]

Major Command	Army request	Committee approved [1]
Inside the United States:		
U.S. Army Forces Command	560,090	441,350
U.S. Army Western Command	14,900	14,900
U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command	141,820	109,550
Military District of Washington	3,800	3,800
U.S. Army Materiel Command	169,790	119,800
Army Ammunition Plants	34,620	0
U.S. Army Information Systems Command	17,200	17,200
U.S. Military Academy	28,500	28,500
U.S. Army Military Traffic Management Command	650	0
Special Project	7,400	7,400
Total inside the United States	978,770	742,500
Outside the United States:		
U.S. Army, Japan	1,200	0
Eighth U.S. Army	134,810	101,050

MAJOR COMMAND SUMMARY—Continued
[In thousands of dollars]

Major Command	Army request	Committee approved [1]
U. S. Army Strategic Defense Command	20,600	20,600
U.S. Army Forces Command	9,320	8,900
U.S. Army, Europe	394,480	282,450
U.S. Army Intelligence and Security Command.	7,750	5,800
Total outside the United States	568,160	418,800
Support:		
Minor construction	20,000	99,070
Design	131,640	131,640
Total support	151,640	230,710
Total military construction authorization	1,698,570	1,392,010

[1] All projects with a cost of $2 million or less are included in the category of minor construction.

FACILITY CATEGORY SUMMARY
[In thousands of dollars]

Facility category	Army request	Committee approved [1]
Operations and training	569,390	467,450
Maintenance and production	301,820	147,300
Army ammunition plants	34,620	0
Research, development, test and evaluation	47,780	45,700
Supply	78,420	70,950
Administrative	23,090	30,300
Housing and community	350,100	279,450
Utilities and ground improvements	141,710	120,150
Minor construction	20,000	99,070
Planning and design	131,640	131,640
Total military construction	1,698,570	1,392,010

[1] All projects with a cost of $2 million or less are included in the category of minor construction.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

The committee approved $9,850,000 for two pollution abatement projects. The projects are listed with the appropriate command's projects.

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

U.S. ARMY FORCES COMMAND

The U.S. Army Forces Command (FORSCOM) has command responsibility for the units, installations, and activities that are principally related to readiness and defense missions. It has command readiness responsibility for most of the deployable troop units in the Army and is responsible for organizing, training, equipping, and ensuring the combat readiness of assigned troop units.

The committee approved $441,350,000 for 23 projects at the following sixteen locations:

Location and project	Thousands
Camp Dawson, WV: Student Training Facility	8,700
Fort Bragg, NC:	
Special Forces Mission Support Facility	6,500
Operations Complex Phase II	5,200
Total	11,700
Fort Campbell, KY: Vehicle Wash Facility	4,500
Fort Carson, CO:	
Range Roads - Phase III	3,500
Vehicle Washrack	7,800
Total	11,300
Fort Devens, MA:	
Academic Instruction Facility	6,800
Academic Instruction Facility	[1] 3,000
Barracks Modernization	4,500
Total	14,300
Fort Drum, NY: 10th Mountain Division Facilities	[2] 200,000
Fort Hood, TX: Vehicle Wash Facility	10,600
Fort Lewis, WA:	
Refuse Incinerator Plant	13,000
Landfill Upgrade	7,500
Total	20,500
Fort McPherson, GA: Operations Facility	2,900
Fort Ord, CA:	
Physical Fitness Training Center	4,450
Flight Simulator Building	2,100
Total	6,550
Fort Polk, LA: Multi-Purpose Range Complex	27,000
Fort Richardson, AK: Barracks Modernization	11,200

Location and project	Thousands
Fort Riley, KS:	
Barracks Modernization	6,100
Primary Water Supply Connection	2,150
Total	8,250
Fort Sheridan, IL: Barracks	2,050
Fort Wainwright, AK: 6th Infantry Division Facilities	96,700
Presidio of Monterey, CA: Barracks	5,100

[1] Project fully authorized at $9,500,000; $3,000,000 approval for authorization of appropriation.

[2] Full authorization for the Tenth Mountain Division facilities was approved by the committee at $615,000,000 with a first year authorization of appropriation of $200,000,000, with the balance to be funded in FY 1988 and 1989.

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location and project	Thousands
Fort Bragg, NC: Tactical Equipment Shop	8,200
Aerial Gunnery Range	2,350
Fort Campbell, KY: Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	16,500
Fort Drum, NY: 10th Mountain Division Facilities	32,000
Fort Hood, TX: Academic Instruction Facility	2,750
Fort Irwin, CA: General Purpose Warehouse	2,050
Fort Lewis, WA: Tactical Equipment Shop	4,400
Fort Riley, KS: Child Development Center	[3] 4,250
Fort Sam Houston, TX: Child Development Center	[3] 2,900
Fort Wainwright, AK: 6th Infantry Division Facilities	30,000

All projects deferred without prejudice unless otherwise noted.

[3] Seek lower cost alternative

U. S. ARMY WESTERN COMMAND

The commander of the U.S. Army Western Command (WESTCOM) commands and supports assigned and attached Active and Army Reserve units, installations and activities in Hawaii and possessions and trust territories in the Pacific administered by the U.S.

The committee approved $14,900,000 for two projects at the following two locations:

Location and project	Thousands
Hawaii, Various: Operations Support Facility	12,000
Wheeler Army Air Field, HI: Flight Simulator Building	2,900

U.S. ARMY TRAINING AND DOCTRINE COMMAND

The U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) is responsible for the Army school system and the principal combat development activities of the Army. It is responsible for individual training for members of the active Army and for Army Reserve component personnel assigned to TRADOC schools and activities.

The committee approved $109,550,000 for nine projects at the following six locations:

Location and project	Thousands
Fort Benning, GA: Vehicle Wash Facility	9,100
Fort Eustis, VA: Applied Instruction Facility	2,050
Fort Jackson, SC: Soldier Service Center	[1] 9,100
Fort Lee, VA:	
General Instruction Building Addition	7,600
Barracks	10,000
Total	17,600
Fort Leonard Wood, MO:	
Engineer School/Post Headquarters Building	14,000
Unaccompanied Officers Housing	13,200
Total	27,200
Fort Rucker, AL:	
Stagefields	27,000
Aerial Gunnery Range	17,500
Total	44,500

[1] Added by the committee.

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location and project	Thousands
Fort Belvoir, VA: Child Development/Religious Education Facility	[2] 5,600
Fort Benning, GA: Vehicle Wash Facility	4,000
Fort Knox, KY: Applied Instruction Facility	3,200
Fort Leonard Wood, MO: Applied Instruction Facility	16,000
Fort Sill, OK: Vehicle Wash Facility	3,050

All projects deferred without prejudice unless otherwise noted.
[2] Seek lower cost alternative

MILITARY DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

The commander of the Military District of Washington (MDW) commands the troop units in the immediate Washington, D.C. area and is responsible for the operation of the installations under his jurisdiction.

The committee approved $3,800,000 for one project at the following location:

Location and project	Thousands
Fort Myer, VA: Physical Fitness Training Center	3,800

U.S. ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND

The U.S. Army Materiel Command (AMC) is responsible for integrated, systematic management of the Army's wholesale materiel activities. The wholesale activities responsiblities range from research through acquisition and distribution to disposal.

The committee approved $119,800,000 for nine projects at the following eight locations:

Location and project	Thousands
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD: Barracks Complex	19,000
Corpus Christi Army Depot, TX:	
Aircraft Maintenance Shop	7,200
Aircraft Maintenance Shop Addition	2,150
Total	9,350
Dugway Proving Ground, UT: Materiel Test Facility	9,700
Fort Monmouth, NJ: Unaccompanied Personnel Housing	4,900
New Cumberland Army Depot, PA: Eastern Distribution Center-Phase II	51,000
Navajo Army Depot, AZ: Security Upgrade	3,900
Redstone Arsenal, AL: Millimeter/Microwave Simulation Facility	19,500
Sierra Army Depot, CA: Security Upgrade	2,450

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location and project	Thousands
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD: Applied Instruction Facility	23,000
Dugway Proving Ground, UT: Community Center	3,200
Hawthorne Army Ammunition Plant, NV: Ammunition Surveillance Facility.	7,000

All projects deferred without prejudice.

U.S. ARMY INFORMATION SYSTEMS COMMAND

The U.S. Army Information Systems Command (USAISC) has world-wide responsibilities for engineering, installing, operating, and maintaining Army's information systems, the Army portion of the defense communications system, and for providing, operating, and maintaining the Army's communications-electronics facilities.

The committee approved $17,200,000 for three projects at the following location:

Location and project	Thousands
Fort Huachuca, AZ:	
Electronic Test and Evaluation Center	3,400
Communication Test Facility	5,600
General Instruction Building	8,200
Total	17,200

U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY

The U.S. Military Academy is responsible for instructing and training the Corps of Cadets in academic studies which are designed to prepare the members for commissioning as officers in the Regular Army.

The committee approved $28,500,000 for two projects at the following location:

Location and project	Thousands
U.S. Military Academy, NY.	
Academic Facility Modernization	15,500
Academic Facility Modernization Phase II	13,000
Total	28,500

SPECIAL PROJECT

Authorization for a special project was requested. The committee approved $7,400,000 for one project at an unspecified location.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

EIGHTH U.S. ARMY

The Eighth U.S. Army provides administrative, medical, and logistical support for U.S. Army units assigned to Korea.

The committee approved $101,050,000 for 25 projects in Korea at the following locations:

Location and project	Thousands
Camp Casey:	
Automated Field Fire Range	3,600
Barracks	15,500
Tactical Equipment Shop Modernization/Addition	3,400
Total, Camp Casey	22,500
Camp Castle: Flammable Material Storage	2,850
Camp Greaves: Barracks	2,350
Camp Hovey:	
Barracks	4,650
Dining Facility	4,350
Total, Camp Hovey	9,000
Camp Howze: Barracks	4,050
Camp Humphreys:	
Tactical Equipment Shop	5,900
Unit Maintenance Hangar	3,700
Barracks	5,700
Total, Camp Humphreys	15,300
Camp Laguardia: Barracks	2,650

Location and project	Thousands
Camp Long: Unaccompanied Personnel Housing	5,600
Camp Red Cloud:	
Tactical Equipment Shop	2,300
Dining Facility	2,250
Total, Camp Red Cloud	4,550
Camp Stanley:	
Barracks	2,450
Dining Facility	2,250
Total, Camp Stanley	4,700
H220: Barracks	2,750
Pusan:	
General Purpose Warehouse	3,800
Barracks	5,900
Total, Pusan	9,700
Second Infantry Division:	
Barracks	2,800
Organizational Maintenance Shop	2,350
Total, Second Infantry Division	5,150
Taegu: Underground Command and Control Facility	4,900
Yongsan:	
Unaccompanied Personnel Housing	2,500
Tactical Equipment Shop	2,500
Total, Yongsan	5,000

The committee did not authorize the following project:

Location and project	Thousands
Camp Greaves: Tactical Equipment Shop	[1] 340

[1] Not needed

U.S. ARMY STRATEGIC DEFENSE COMMAND

The mission of the U. S. Army Strategic Defense Command (USASDC) is to coordinate and control all work and associated resources involved in developing and testing effective ballistic missile defense systems.

The committee approved $20,600,000 for four projects at the following location:

Location and project	Thousands
Kwajalein:	
Multiple Object Tracking Facility	2,400
Mission Control Center Modification	5,100
Unaccompanied Officers Housing	11,000
Harbor/Channel Dredging	2,100
Total	20,600

U.S. ARMY FORCES COMMAND

The U.S. Army Forces Command has command responsibility for the units, installations, and activities that are principally related to readiness and defense missions. It has command readiness responsibility for the bulk of the deployable troop units in the Army and is responsible for organizing, training, equipping, and insuring the combat readiness of assigned troop units.

The committee approved $8,900,000 for two projects at the following location:

Location and project	Thousands
OCONUS-Unspecified:	
Pre-Positioned War Material Facilities	4,900
Classified Project	4,000
Total	8,900

U.S. ARMY, EUROPE

The U.S. Army, Europe, provides administrative, medical, and logistical support for the U.S. Army, Europe, and the Seventh Army.

The committee approved $282,450,000 for 36 projects at the following locations:

Location and project	Thousands
Aschaffenburg, Germany:	
Tactical Equipment Shop	3,350
Hardstand	3,650
Total Aschaffenburg	7,000
Baumholder, Germany:	
Sewer/POL Separator	2,050
Command and Control Building	10,000
Facility Modernization Phase IV	12,400
Ammunition Storage	4,400
Total Baumholder	28,850
Bitburg, Germany:	
Barracks	13,800
Heating Plant	2,550
Total Bitburg	16,350
Einsiedlerhof, Germany: Training Exercise Facility	4,750

Location and project	Thousands
Frankfurt, Germany: Crime Laboratory Modernization/Addition	3,500
Giessen, Germany:	
Dining Facility	2,100
Fuel Station	3,500
Total Giessen	5,600
Hanau, Germany:	
Facility Modernization	11,000
Hardstand	2,500
Flight Simulator Building Addition	3,700
Total Hanau	17,200
Heilbronn, Germany: Barracks	2,100
Hohenfels, Germany: Combat Maneuver Training Complex	8,800
Karlsruhe, Germany: Facility Modernization	10,000
Mannheim, Germany: Range Complex	2,450
New Ulm, Germany:	
Site Support Upgrade	2,850
Site Support Upgrade	19,000
Tactical Equipment Shop	4,200
Total New Ulm	26,050
Nuernberg, Germany: Barracks	5,500
Rheinberg, Germany:	
Physical Fitness Training Center	4,900
Barracks with Dining	14,800
Logistical Supply Facility	6,700
Administrative Space Alterations	7,200
Total Rheinberg	33,600
Schweinfurt, Germany:	
Facility Modernization Phase IV	8,500
Tactical Equipment Shop	13,600
Total Schweinfurt	22,100
Various, Germany:	
Wartime Host Nation Support	17,500

Location and project	Thousands
Site Security Enhancements	17,000
Total Various	34,500
Vilseck, Germany:	
Unaccompanied Officers Housing	4,050
Chapel/Religious Education Facility	3,450
Utilities	36,000
Barracks	6,800
Total Vilseck	50,300
Wildflecken, Germany: Vehicle Wash Facility	3,800

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location and project	Thousands
Bad Kreuznach, Germany: Facility Modernization	10,200
Bamberg, Germany: Facility Modernization	18,000
Giessen, Germany: Facility Modernization	16,000
Hanau, Germany: Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	7,100
Schweinfurt, Germany: Facility Modernization	16,000
Vilseck, Germany: Commissary Sales Store	[1] 7,300
Exchange Shopping Center	[1] 8,000

All projects deferred without prejudice unless otherwise noted.

[1] Use nonappropriated funds.

U. S. ARMY INTELLIGENCE AND SECURITY COMMAND, OVERSEAS

The U. S. Army Intelligence and Security Command is responsible for performing intelligence functions in support of Army field commanders and in fulfillment and support of those national intelligence responsibilities assigned to the Army.

The committee approved $5,800,000 for two projects at the following locations:

Location and project	Thousands
Location 276: Barracks Modernization	3,700
Location 280: Air Conditioning Upgrade	2,100

SUPPORT ACTIVITIES

The support activities include resources for accomplishing design work on current and future military construction projects, for minor construction, and for accomplishing urgent requirements anticipated to arise during fiscal year 1987.

The committee approved $212,110,000 for the following elements of the support program:

Location and project	Thousands
Various locations, worldwide:	
Architectural and engineering services	131,640
Minor Construction ($2 million and less)	99,070
Total	230,710

SUMMARY OF ARMY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION ACTIONS

A summary of actions taken on the request of the Army is tabulated by project as follows:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	Cost
Army request	1,698,570
U. S. Forces Command:	
Fort Bragg, NC:	
Tactical Equipment Shop	-8,200
Aerial Gunnery Range	-2,350
Fort Campbell, KY: Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	-16,500
Fort Devens, MA: Academic Instruction Facility	[1] -6,500
Fort Drum, NY: 10th Mountain Division Facilities	-32,000
Fort Hood, TX: Academic Instruction Facility	-2,750
Fort Irwin, CA: General Purpose Warehouse	-2,050
Fort Lewis, WA: Tactical Equipment Shop	-4,400
Fort Riley, KS: Child Development Center	-4,250
Fort Sam Houston, TX: Child Development Center	-2,900
Fort Wainwright, AK: 6th Infantry Division Facilities	-30,000
U. S. Army Training and Doctrine Command:	
Fort Belvoir, VA: Child Development/Religious Education Facility	-5,600
Fort Benning, GA: Vehicle Wash Facility	-4,000
Fort Jackson, SC: Soldier Service Center	+9,100
Fort Knox, KY: Applied Instruction Facility	-3,200
Fort Leonard Wood, MO: Applied Instruction Facility	-16,000
Fort Sill, OK: Vehicle Wash Facility	-3,050
U. S. Army Materiel Command:	
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD: Applied Instruction Facility	-23,000
Dugway Proving Ground, UT: Community Center	-3,200
Hawthorne Army Ammunition Plant, NV: Ammunition Surveillance Facility	-7,000
Army Ammunition Plants:	[2] -34,620
Eighth U. S. Army:	
Camp Greaves: Tactical Equipment Shop	-340
U. S. Army Forces Command, Overseas:	
Fort Kobbe, Panama	-420
U. S. Army Europe:	
Bad Kreuznach, Germany: Facility Modernization	-10,200
Bamberg, Germany: Facility Modernization	-18,000
Giessen, Germany: Facility Modernization	-16,000
Hanau, Germany: Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	-7,100
Schweinfurt, Germany: Facility Modernization	-16,000
Vilseck, Germany: Commissary Sales Store	-7,300
Exchange Shopping Center	-8,000
Drama, Greece: Operations Building Modernization	-730
Minor Construction, Unspecified	-20,000
Subtotal of actions	-306,560
Total, military construction authorization for appropriations	1,392,010

---

[1] Project fully authorized at $9,500,000; approved authorization of appropriation for $3,000,000.

[2] Authorized in Procurement of Ammunition, Army portion of DoD Authorization Act.

FAMILY HOUSING

The Army presented an authorization request for appropriations for the Army Family Housing program as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Category	Army request	Committee approved
Construction:		
New family housing (3,400 units requested)	293,380	283,830
Post acquisition construction	146,000	79,500
Planning and design	24,000	24,000
Total construction	463,380	387,330
Operation and maintenance (157,388 units):		
Operating expenses	238,870	226,870
Maintenance	587,852	587,852
Total operation and maintenance	826,722	814,722
Utilities:		
Utilities expenses	268,596	268,596
Total utilities	268,596	268,596
Leasing:		
Foreign (22,581 units)	142,639	142,639
Domestic (825 units)	4,310	4,310
Section 801 (6,600 units)	26,936	26,936
Section 802 (1,200 units)	0	0
Total leasing	173,885	173,885
Debt payment:		
Principal	7,646	7,646
Interest and other expenses	347	347
Servicemen's mortgage insurance premiums	70	70
Total debt payment	8,063	8,063
Total Army family housing request	1,740,646	1,652,596
Total authorized for appropriation, Army family housing		1,652,596

The Army family housing program authorization for appropriations request totaled $1,740,646,000. The total request of $1,740,646,000 compares with $1,626,845,000 for fiscal year 1986.

NEW CONSTRUCTION

The committee approved $283,830,000 for 3,290 units of new construction at the following locations:

Location	Units	Cost (thousands)
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD	140	9,700
Fort Drum, NY	1,200	91,000
Kwajalein, Marshall Islands	136	23,000
Fort Ord, CA	385	34,000
Fort Polk, LA	583	37,000
Seneca Army Depot, NY	30	2,900
Fort Wainwright, AK	150	33,000
Crailsheim, Germany	40	4,100
Darmstadt, Germany	40	3,150
Erlangen, Germany	106	9,400
Herzo Base, Germany	34	3,300
Schweinfurt, Germany	90	8,400
Vilseck, Germany	224	21,000
Wildflecken, Germany	24	2,050
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD (Mobile Home Spaces)	70	1,100
Fort Irwin, CA (Mobile Home Spaces)	38	730

The committee did not authorize the following new construction for family housin units at Mainz, Germany, in the amount of $1,850,000 because the project is no longer required. The committee also denied authorization for Livorno, Italy for $7,700,000, because the Department cannot presently execute the project.

POST ACQUISITION CONSTRUCTION

The committee approved $79,500,000 for improvements to existing family housing units at installations inside the United States; installations in Japan; installations i

Korea and communities in Germany. The committee made this reduction based on the authorization balance remaining from the fiscal year 1986 authorization, which was larger than the fiscal year 1986 family housing appropriation. The committee further directed the Department to use the remaining improvement balance from fiscal year 1986 toward fiscal year 1987 authorization requirements.

PLANNING AND DESIGN

The committee approved $24,000,000 for planning and design. These funds will be used to plan for and design future year projects as well as to complete the design of fiscal year 1987 projects in new construction, improvements and energy conservation.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

The committee approved $814,722,000 for operation and maintenance of the fiscal year 1987 estimated average inventory of 157,388 housing units. The committee reduced the furnishings subaccount by $12,000,000 due to budgetary constraints. Reimbursements are anticipated to be $14,000,000.

UTILITIES

The committee approved $268,596,000 for utilities of the fiscal year 1987 estimated average inventory of 157,388 housing units.

LEASING

The committee approved $142,639,000 for foreign leasing. The committee is aware of the Army requirement to remedy its housing shortfalls in foreign countries through a program of both new construction and foreign leasing dependent upon which is the more economical to accomplish. The committee approved $4,310,000 for domestic leasing, and $26,936,000 for Section 801 housing.

DEBT PAYMENT

The committee approved $8,063,000 for principal and interest payment on mortgage Capehart and Wherry housing units and Servicemen's Mortgage Insurance Premiums.

Summary of family housing actions

Total Request	$1,740,646
Mainz, Germany: new construction	-1,850
Livorno, Italy: new construction	-7,700
Operations expenses: furnishings subaccount	-12,000
Improvements	-66,500
Subtotal of actions	-88,050
Total, family housing authorization for appropriation.	$1,652,596

HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

The committee approved the Army request of $6,000,000 for this program.

LIGHT INFANTRY DIVISIONS

The Congress authorized and appropriated in fiscal year 1986 funds to begin construction at Fort Drum, New York for the stationing of the 10th Mountain Division. The Secretary has requested for fiscal year 1987 a total authority of $615 million and appropriations of $232 million as well as advanced appropriations of $221 million in fiscal year 1988 and $162 million in fiscal year 1989. The committee has recommended authorization of $615 million and authorization of appropriations of $200 million for fiscal year 1987.

The committee believes that the multiyear single authorization gives the Congress an opportunity to review the whole project rather than a single year's increment while simplifying the approval process. This approach also insures maximum flexibility for the execution of the program. However, the committee does not endorse the concept of advanced appropriations and, therefore, has deferred the department's request for fiscal years 1988 and 1989. The department should request fiscal year funding as it is required.

The committee agreed to authorize $96,700 to initiate construction for the 6th Infantry Division in Alaska for fiscal year 1987. The Secretary should request in fiscal year 1988 multiyear single authorization for the balance of the construction and authorization for appropriation for as much as can be executed in fiscal year 1988.

DUAL AUTHORIZATION OF ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT PROJECTS

In the recent past, the Department of the Army has requested authorizations for construction associated with ammunition plants in both Military Construction and Department of Defense authorization acts. This has resulted in duplication in the authorization process and in projects being authorized twice. To eliminate this problem, the committee directs that the authorizations for construction associated with ammunition plants in fiscal year 1988 and subsequent years be obtained in Department of Defense authorization acts only. The fiscal year 1987 authorization has been provided only in the Department of Defense authorization act and not in the Military Construction authorization act in conformance with this new policy.

GALVESTON ISLAND

The committee instructs the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to conduct a study regarding the extent of its present use and need for the Fort San Jacinto site on Galveston Island in anticipation of that site no longer being available for extensive federal use in the near future. The committee also instructs the Army Corps of Engineers to study the suitability of an alternative spoils site in the area, Pelican Island, an island just south of the Fort San Jacinto site; the study shall be completed within six months. The committee anticipates a possible transfer of land deeds with respect to both the Pelican Island and Fort San Jacinto sites and believes it is mandatory for the Army Corps of Engineers to continue having the capabilities to effectively carry out its spoils functions on the Houston Ship Channel.

FORT CHAFEE, ARKANSAS

The community of Barling, Arkansas has discussed with the Department of the Army its desire to enter into a long term lease of land on Fort Chafee, Arkansas, for the purpose of constructing and operating a waste treatment plant to serve the city. Because of topography and land use, land on the military installation may be the only practical location for this function. To date, there has been no agreement or final position from the Army on whether this request might be favorably considered.

The committee hopes that the operational requirements of the post and the community can both be satisfied. The Department of the Army is directed to conduct a thorough analysis of this issue and provide the Committees on Armed Services a report on this matter no later than December 31, 1986. At a minimum, this report should discuss the background of the city of Barling's requirement, alternative locations for new waste treatment facilities, and the impact of such an activity on the Fort Chafee current and future missions.

FORTIFICATIONS IN GERMANY

The Secretary of Defense not later than February 27, 1987 shall report to the Congress the reasons that there are no fixed fortifications in Germany to help defend against a Soviet attack and the costs, benefits and disadvantages of the construction of such fortifications. The term fixed fortifications is meant to include: anti-tank barriers, fortified gun positions, hardened communications and command and control facilities in forward areas, hardened medical treatment facilities and such other construction that would assist in the delay and disruption of a Soviet attack into West Germany and which would also serve to protect NATO forces in the conduct of the defense.

TITLE II - NAVY

The Navy requested authorization for appropriations of $2,588,293,000. The Committee, after careful review and consideration of the Navy request, approved $2,236,843,000 for the following programs:

	Navy request	Committee approved
Military construction:		
Inside the United States	1,428,855,000	1,082,595,000
Outside the United States	156,905,000	107,670,000
Prior Year Authorization	45,450,000 1/	45,450,000
Design	143,770,000	143,770,000
Minor construction	15,000,000	114,375,000
Access roads	5,400,000	5,400,000
Total, MILCON authorized	1,795,380,000	1,499,260,000

1/ NSB Kings Bay Georgia, drydock Section 201(a) Military Construction Authorization Act, 1986

	Navy request	Committee approved
Military Family Housing:		
Construction, improvements, and design..............	230,322,000	176,992,000
Support..................	562,591,000	560,591,000
Total family housing..	792,913,000	737,583,000
Grand total, Navy.....	2,588,293,000	2,236,843,000

The Navy's authorization for appropriations request for Military Construction and Family Housing and the Committee's recommendations are as follows:

MAJOR COMMAND SUMMARY

[In thousands of dollars]

Major command	Navy request	Committee approved
Inside the United States:		
US Marine Corps..........................	259,850	224,400
Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command	1,870	0
Chief of Naval Operations...............	30,790	2,260
Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet......	127,180	79,680
Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet.......	346,575	260,775
Chief of Naval Education and Training...	148,930	106,480
Naval Medical Command...................	2,360	0
Naval Oceanography Command..............	980	0
Naval Telecommunications Command........	3,830	2,750
Naval Security Group Command............	16,170	13,400
Naval Supply Systems Command............	25,270	3,140
Naval Air Systems Command...............	75,240	73,290
Naval Facilities Engineering Command....	61,770	50,190
Naval Sea Systems Command...............	154,460	126,400
Office of the Chief of Naval Research...	41,190	37,440
Strategic Systems Project Office........	132,390	122,390
Total Authorization, Inside the United States.......	1,428,855	1,102,595
Less Amount not Authorized for Appropriation	0	20,000
Total Authorization for Appropriation, Inside the United States.......	1,428,855	1,082,595

MAJOR COMMAND SUMMARY - Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Major command	Navy request	Committee approved
Outside the United States:		
US Marine Corps	13,220	12,390
Chief of Naval Operations	300	0
Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet	42,805	26,600
Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet	28,340	28,650
Commander in Chief, U.S. Naval Forces Europe	47,920	25,800
Naval Telecommunications Command	11,730	8,250
Naval Security Group Command	5,190	2,250
Naval Facilities Engineering Command	3,670	0
Office of the Chief of Naval Research	3,730	3,730
Total, Outside the United States	156,905	107,670
Prior Year Authorization	45,450	45,450
Total	1,631,210	1,235,715
Support:		
Minor Construction	15,000	114,375
Architectural & Engineering Services	143,770	143,770
Defense Access Roads	5,400	5,400
Total, support	164,170	263,545
Total, military construction	1,795,380	1,499,260
Total, family housing	792,913	737,583
Grand Total, Navy	2,588,293	2,236,843

FACILITY CATEGORY SUMMARY

[In thousands of dollars]

	Request			Committee Approved		
Description	Navy	Marine Corps	Total	Navy	Marine Corps	Total
Operational	425,230	29,390	454,620	422,070	43,790	465,860
Training	124,650	13,450	138,100	91,580	7,950	99,530
Maintenance & Production	203,060	84,270	287,330	110,850	71,890	182,740
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation	51,700	0	51,700	51,700	0	51,700
Supply	110,010	16,490	126,500	51,010	5,400	56,410
Medical	0	0	0	0	0	0
Administrative	24,200	26,890	51,090	19,510	26,890	46,400
Troop Housing	149,740	87,010	236,750	133,270	91,630	224,900
Community Support	59,220	6,370	65,590	17,120	9,000	26,120
Utilities	103,295	4,540	107,835	103,195	4,540	107,735
Energy Conservation	10,430	0	10,430	8,330	0	8,330
Pollution Abatement	13,390	1,720	15,110	18,490	1,720	20,210
Real Estate	82,915	2,940	85,855	66,915	2,940	69,855
Subtotal	1,357,840	273,070	1,630,910	1,094,040	265,750	1,359,790
Defense Access Roads	-	-	5,400	-	-	5,400

FACILITY CATEGORY SUMMARY - Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Request			Committee Approved		
Description	Navy	Marine Corps	Total	Navy	Marine Corps	Total
Unspecified Minor........	-	-	15,000	-	-	0
Architectural and Engineering Services and Construction Design..	-	-	143,770	-	-	143,770
North Atlantic Treaty Organization	-	-	300	-	-	300
Subtotal			1,795.380			1,509,260
Less General Reduction (Minor Construction)						-10,000
TOTAL						1,499,260

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

The committee approved $20,210,000 for 21 pollution abatement projects. The projects are listed with the appropriate command's projects.

ENERGY CONSERVATION INVESTMENT PROGRAM

The committee approved $8,330,000 for 8 energy conservation projects. The projects are listed with the appropriate command's projects.

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

The Marine Corps is responsible for providing air and ground forces for the seizure and defense of advanced naval bases and the conduct of land operations incident to the prosecution of the naval campaign.

The committee approved $224,400,000 for 35 projects at the following 12 locations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	Cost
Headquarters Marine Corps, Arlington, VA:	
Physical fitness center..................................	3,020
Total..	3,020
Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, NC:	
Combat vehicle maintenance shop.........................	2,850
Electronics and communications maintenance shop.......	4,610
Battalion operations facility...........................	3,250
Bachelor enlisted quarters..............................	17,700
Mess hall..	4,810
Total..	33,220
Marine Corps Air Station, Camp Pendleton, CA:	
Ordnance handling pad...................................	3,040
Aircraft operations building and control tower........	2,160
Engine test cell..	3,240
Total..	8,440

TABLE 38

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, CA:		
Parachute and survival equipment shop	2,160	
Combat vehicle maintenance shop	4,320	
Bachelor enlisted quarters	12,300	
Mess Hall additions and modernizations	5,100	
Physical fitness center	2,850	
Total	26,730	
Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, NC:		
Troop and cargo staging facility	6,870	
Tactical air combat training facility	3,730	
Refueling vehicle maintenance shops	2,060	
Total	12,660	
Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, CA:		
Runway extension	14,400	1/
Maintenance hangar modernization	11,880	
Total	26,280	
Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, HI:		
Tacticel support van pads	8,840	
Corrosion control hangar	2,260	
Company and battery operations center	9,130	
Bachelor enlisted quarters modernization	8,800	
Flight line security improvements	2,550	
Total	31,580	
Marine Corps Air Station, New River, NC:		
Maintenance hangar modernizations	15,120	
Bachelor enlisted quarters	4,900	
Total	20,020	
Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, SC:		
Clothing issue	2,630	1/
Bachelor officer quarters	4,620	1/
Total	7,250	
Marine Corps Air Station, Tustin, CA:		
Air traffic control squadron facility	2,450	
Bachelor enlisted quarters	10,800	
Total	13,250	
Marine Corps Air-Ground Combat Center, Twentynine Palms, CA:		
Organizational automotive maintenance shop	9,820	
Regimental battalion operations center	3,930	
Bachelor enlisted quarters	22,600	
Total	36,350	
Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, AZ:		
Maintenance hangars additions	2,650	
Marine air control squadron facility	2,950	
Total	5,600	

1/ Committee add

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	Cost	
Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, NC:		
Field maintenance complex	5,900	1/
Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, CA:		
Training support center	5,500	1/
Communications support storehouse	2,650	1/

TABLE 40

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, HI:	
Combat vehicle maintenance shop	6,480 1/
Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, CA:	
Supply complex	8,440 1/
Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, AZ:	
Battalion headquarters	2,050 1/

1/ Budget constraints

CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

The Chief of Naval Operations is responsible for certain central executive organizations, assigned shore activities, and the operating forces of the Navy.

The committee approved $2,260,000 for 1 project at the following location:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	Cost
Naval Academy, Annapolis, MD:	
Educational computer center	$ 2,260
Total	2,260

The committee did not authorize the following project:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	Cost
Commandant Naval District, Washington, DC:	
White House support complex	24,000 1/

1/ Insufficient design

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, ATLANTIC FLEET

The Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet, is responsible for air, surface, submarine and fleet marine forces and supporting shore installations within the Atlantic region.

The committee approved $79,680,000 for 8 projects at the following 7 locations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and Project	Cost
Naval Air Station, Brunswick, ME:	
Ground support equipment maintenance facility	2,160
Total	2,160
Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, FL:	
Bachelor enlisted quarters	3,730
Total	3,730
Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, FL:	
Aircraft parking apron	2,160
Brig	2,650
Total	4,810
Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, VA:	
Beach group operations facilities	5,890
Total	5,890
Naval Supply Center Detachment, Mayport, FL:	
Fleet support warehouse addition	3,730
Total	3,730

Naval Submarine Base, New London, CT:	
Quaywall	3,160
Total	3,160
Naval Station, New York, NY:	
Battleship support complex (increment II)	56,200 1/
Total	56,200

1/ Reduced by $6,000,000, budget constraints

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	Cost
Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, FL:	
Aircraft acoustical enclosure	4,910 1/
Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, FL:	
Helicopter training facility	4,220 1/
Naval Air Station, Key West, FL:	
Hydrofoil berthing wharf	8,490 1/
Naval Submarine Base, New London, CT:	
Weapons storage improvements	2,950 1/
Bachelor officer quarters	9,300 2/

1/ Budget constraints
2/ Use third party financing

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, PACIFIC FLEET

The Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet is responsible for air, surface, submarine and fleet marine forces and supporting shore installations within the Pacific region.

The committee approved $260,775,000 for 22 projects at the following 15 locations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	Cost
Naval Air Station, Adak, AK:	
Radar support facilities	24,400
Total	24,400
Naval Facility, Adak, AK:	
Terminal building addition	5,700
Total	5,700
Naval Air Station Alameda, CA	
Berthing pier and utilities improvements	17,675
Total	17,675
Naval Submarine Base, Bangor, WA:	
Bachelor enlisted quarters	4,900
Electrical distribution system improvements	5,600
Total	10,500
Naval Amphibious Base, Coronado, CA:	
Sealift support pier	2,550
Bachelor officer quarters	9,800
Electrical distribution system improvements	5,100
Total	17,450

Naval Station, Everett, WA:	
Carrier support complex (increment II)	85,400 1/
Total	85,400
Naval Air Station, Fallon, NV:	
Parallel runway	17,000
Electronic warfare range improvements	7,800 2/
Land acquisition	6,400
Total	31,200
Naval Station, Long Beach, CA:	
Bachelor enlisted quarters	7,050
Total	7,050
Naval Magazine, Lualualei, HI:	
Missile maintenance facility	2,850
Total	2,850
Naval Air Station, Miramar, CA:	
Maintenance hangar addition	5,110
Avionics shop addition	3,240
Bachelor enlisted quarters	13,200
Total	21,550
Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, HI:	
Seal team training and support building	3,240
Total	3,240
Naval Station, San Diego, CA:	
Bachelor enlisted quarters	18,200
Total	18,200
Naval Submarine Base, San Diego, CA:	
Bachelor enlisted quarters	9,100
Total	9,100
Naval Station, Seattle, WA:	
Brig	2,950
Total	2,950
Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, WA:	
Aircraft parking apron	3,510
Total	3,510

1/ Reduced by $10 million because of budget constraints
2/ Repricing

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	Cost
Naval Submarine Base, Bangor, WA:	
Security building	2,750 1/
Naval Air Station, Barbers Point, HI:	
TACAMO support complex	25,300 2/
Naval Amphibious Base, Coronado, CA:	
Operational storage warehouse	3,720 1/
Naval Station, Long Beach, CA:	
Bachelor officer quarters	3,730 3/

1/ Budget constraints
2/ Use West Coast basing
3/ Use third party financing

CHIEF OF NAVAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

The Chief of Naval Education and Training is responsible for the education and training of all naval personnel.

The committee approved $106,480,000 for 21 projects at the following 16 locations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	Cost
Naval Guided Missiles School, Dam Neck, VA:	
Submarine training building addition	3,140
Total	3,140
Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, IL:	
Fire fighting trainer	5,300
Total	5,300
Naval Air Station, Kingsville, TX:	
Jet engine test cell facility	3,140
Total	3,140
Naval Air Station, Memphis, TN:	
Aviation ordnanceman training building	12,800
Brig	2,750
Total	15,550
Naval Air Station, Meridian, MS:	
Airfield pavements	3,170
Total	3,170
Naval Submarine School, New London, CT:	
Advanced engineering training facility	6,200
Submarine fire fighting trainer facility	3,340
Total	9,540
Naval Education and Training Center, Newport, RI:	
Bachelor officer quarters	8,800
Utility systems improvements	2,900
Total	11,700
Fleet Training Center, Norfolk, VA:	
Electrical trades training building addition	5,400
Total	5,400
Naval Training Center, Orlando, FL:	
Barracks	8,440
Total	8,440
Naval Diving and Salvage Training Center, Panama City, FL:	
Diver training building addition	2,850
Total	2,850
Naval Technical Training Center, Pensacola, FL:	
Instrumentman training facility	4,610
Total	4,610
Fleet Intelligence Training Center, Pacific, San Diego, CA:	
Intelligence training building	4,220
Total	4,220

Location and project	Cost
Fleet Training Center, San Diego, CA:	
Weapons training building	3,930
Total	3,930
Naval Training Center, San Diego, CA:	
Machinery repairman training building	5,700
Barracks	4,220
Electrical distribution system improvements	8,250
Total	18,170
Combat Systems Technical Schools Command, Mare Island, Vallejo, CA:	
Combat systems maintenance training facility	5,200
Total	5,200
Naval Air Station, Whiting Field, FL:	
Runway improvement	2,120
Total	2,120

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	Cost
Surface Warfare Officers School Command, Newport, RI:	
Surface warfare officer training facility	8,840 1/
Naval Training Center, Orlando, FL:	
Advanced underwater weapons training facility	2,950 1/
Public works shop	2,550 1/
Naval Construction Training Center, Port Hueneme, CA:	
Seabee fleet support training facilities	3,240 1/
Naval Training Center, San Diego, CA:	
Bridge	2,950 1/
Naval Technical Training Center, San Francisco, CA:	
Fire fighting trainer facility	9,820 1/

1/ Budget constraints

NAVAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

The Naval Telecommunications Command is responsible for providing communications by satellite and radio for administrative functions and command and control of Navy ships.

The committee approved $2,750,000 for 1 project at the following location:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	Cost
Naval Communications Station, Stockton, CA	
Fire protection pipeline	2,750
Total	2,750

NAVAL SECURITY GROUP COMMAND

The Naval Security Group Command is responsible for signal intelligence, protection of U.S. Navy signals and other exploitable emissions, special communications systems, technical research and development for the creation of new systems and equipment and Navy-wide support of the Armed Forces Courier Service.

The committee approved $13,400,000 for 1 project at the following location:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	Cost
Naval Security Group Activity, Adak, AK:	
Ocean surveillance building	13,400
Total	13,400

NAVAL SUPPLY SYSTEMS COMMAND

The Naval Supply Systems Command is responsible for procuring, storing, and issuing general supplies, subsistence, spares, fuel and services to Navy fleet and shore activities.

The committee approved $3,140,000 for one project at the following location:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	Cost
Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, VA:	
Hazardous materials storage and handling Facility addition	3,140
Total	3,140

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	Cost
Naval Supply Center, Oakland, CA:	
General warehouse addition and modernization	2,950 1/
Naval Supply Center, Pearl Harbor, HI:	
Cold storage facility	11,820 1/
Naval Supply Center, San Diego, CA:	
Railroad track relocation	2,450 1/

1/ Budget constraints

NAVAL AIR SYSTEMS COMMAND

The Naval Air Systems Command is responsible for providing aviation technical support to fleet operating units; research, development, test and evaluation support for Navy aircraft and missiles; and depot level aircraft and missile rework facilities.

The committee approved $73,290,000 for 8 projects at the following 4 locations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	Cost
Pacific Missile Range Facility, Barking Sands, HI:	
Range operations center addition	2,360
Aircraft maintenance hangar and support facilities	5,900
Total	8,260
Naval Air Rework Facility, Cherry Point, NC:	
Aircraft rework facility	21,600
Aircraft engine blade rework facility	15,600
Total	37,200
Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River, MD:	
Landing system test facility	4,030
Aircraft test and evaluation facility	13,300
Steam and condensate systems	2,450
Total	19,780
Naval Air Rework Facility, Pensacola, FL:	
Aircraft structures repair facility	8,050
Total	8,050

NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND

The Naval Facilities Engineering Command is responsible for providing public works, utilities, housing, transportation, engineering and construction services, and planning support for the operating forces and shore activities of the Navy and Marine Corps and supports the Naval Construction Force.

The committee approved $50,190,000 for 6 projects at the following 4 locations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	Cost
Naval Construction Battalion Center, Gulfport, MS:	
Controlled humidity storage facilities................	14,200
Total..	14,200
Navy Public Work Center, Norfolk, VA:	
Maintenance storage facility.........................	2,450
Steam plant improvements............................	5,600
Total..	8,050
Navy Public Works Center, Pearl Harbor, HI:	
Electrical distribution system improvements (Phase I)	18,200
Water distribution system improvements..............	6,700
Total..	24,900
Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, CA:	
Bachelor officer quarters...........................	3,040
Total..	3,040

The committee did not authorize the following project:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	Cost
Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, CA:	
Engineering support facility........................	3,140 1/

1/ Budget constraints

NAVAL SEA SYSTEMS COMMAND

The Naval Sea Systems Command is responsible for procuring and maintaining the Navy's ships, submarines, ammunition, weapons and weapons systems.

The committee approved $126,400,000 for 14 projects at the following 11 locations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	Cost
Charleston Naval Shipyard, Charleston, SC:	
Drydock pumphouse alterations.......................	7,860
Hazardous and flammable materials storehouse........	2,950
Total..	10,810
Naval Weapons Station, Charleston, SC:	
Pier improvements...................................	6,130
Total..	6,130
Naval Weapons Support Center, Crane, IN:	
Fleet microwave support center......................	6,880
Total..	6,880

Naval Weapons Station, Earle, NJ:	
Ammunition pier and trestle	52,500 1/
Total	52,500
Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, Kittery, ME:	
Refueling crane	6,190
Hazardous material storage and handling facility	5,100
Engineering management building	10,900
Total	22,190
Long Beach Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, CA:	
Hazardous waste facility	2,450
Total	2,450
Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Pascagoula, MS:	
Land acquisition and building modernization	4,120
Total	4,120
Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, VA:	
Bachelor enlisted quarters	5,900
Total	5,900
Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach, CA:	
Quality evaluation laboratory	6,100
Total	6,100
Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, CA:	
Sewage Treatment Facility	5,100 2/
Total	5,100
Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, VA:	
Missile storage facilities	4,220
Total	4,220

1/ Phase fund. $32,500,000 in FY 1987 and $20,000,000 in FY 1988
2/ Committee add

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	Cost
Naval Weapons Station, Charleston, SC:	
Consolidated brig	16,500 1/
Naval Ordnance Station, Indian Head, MD:	
Propellant facilities upgrade	3,680 2/
Naval Undersea Warfare Engineering Station, Keyport, WA:	
Missile magazines	5,890 2/

1/ Not justified
2/ Budget constraints

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL RESEARCH

The Office of the Chief of Naval Research is responsible for naval research related to the maintenance of future naval power and the preservation of the national security.

The committee approved $37,440,000 for 7 projects at the following 3 locations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	Cost
Naval Weapons Center, China Lake, CA:	
Guided missile laboratory	10,300

Mess hall	2,450
Total	12,750
Naval Surface Weapons Center, Dahlgren, VA:	
AEGIS education center addition	2,950
Weapons system development laboratory addition	3,730
AEGIS computer center addition	3,830
Personnel support facilities	5,450
Total	15,960
Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, DC:	
Physics laboratory improvements	8,730
Total	8,730

STRATEGIC SYSTEMS PROJECT OFFICE

The Strategic Systems Project Office is the single manager responsible for the design, development, production and support of the Navy's submarine launched ballistic missile weapon systems.

The committee approved $122,390,000 for one projects at the following location:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	Cost
Naval Submarine Base, Kings Bay, GA:	
TRIDENT support complex	$122,390 1/

1/ Reduced by $10,000,000 because of budget constraints. $5,100,000 to be used for community impact assistance.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

For the Marine Corps outside the United States, the committee approved $12,390,000 for 3 projects at the following 2 locations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	Cost
Marine Corps Air Station, Futenma, Okinawa, JA:	
Engine maintenance shop	3,440
Total	3,440
Marine Corps Base Camp Smedley D. Butler, Okinawa, JA:	
Electronics and communications maintenance shop	2,750
Building environmental improvements	6,200
Total	8,950

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, ATLANTIC FLEET

For the Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet, outside the United States, the committee approved $26,600,000 for 5 projects at the following 4 locations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	Cost
Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, CU:	
Standby electric power generators	2,600
Total	2,600
Naval Air Station, Keflavik, IC:	
Airfield pavements	13,490
Total	13,490

Atlantic Fleet Weapons Training Facility, Roosevelt Roads, PR:	
Range operations center addition	4,220
Total	4,220
Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, PR:	
Construction battalion equipment maintenance facility.	3,930
Security facilities	2,360
Total	6,290

The committee did not authorize the following project:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	Cost
Naval Air Station, Keflavik, IC:	
Fuel facilities	13,300 1/

1/ Not needed

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, PACIFIC FLEET

For the Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet, outside the United States, the committee approved $28,650,000 for 4 projects at the following 4 locations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	Cost
Naval Air Facility, Atsugi, JA:	
Fire protection	5,300 1/
Total	5,300
Administrative Support Unit, Bahrain Island	
Indoor recreation facility	2,550
Total	2,550
Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, RP:	
Bachelor officer quarters	5,300
Total	5,300
Mobile Construction Battalion, Camp Covington, Guam:	
Bachelor housing	15,500
Total	15,500

1/ Committee add

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, U. S. NAVAL FORCES, EUROPE

The Commander in Chief, U.S. Naval Forces, Europe is responsible for the Naval component of the unified U.S. European Command.

The committee approved $25,800,000 for 3 projects at the following 3 locations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	Cost
Naval Support Activity, Naples, IT:	
Air cargo terminal	5,500
Total	5,500
Naval Station, Rota, SP:	
Pol pipeline improvements	4,600
Total	4,600
Classified Location:	
Magazines	15,700
Total	15,700

The committee did not authorize the following project:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	Cost
Naval Support Activity, Naples, IT:	
Command control communications and intelligence....	18,000 1/

1/ Not justified

NAVAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

For the Naval Telecommunications Command, outside the United States, the committee approved $8,250,000 for 1 project at the following location:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	Cost
Naval Communication Area Master Station Mediterranean, Naples, IT:	
Sigonella transmitter facility........................	8,250
Total..	8,250

NAVAL SECURITY GROUP COMMAND

For the Naval Security Group Command outside the United States, the committee approved $2,250,000 for 1 project at the following location:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	Cost
Naval Security Group Activity, Edzell, Scotland, UK:	
Ocean surveillance building additions................	2,250
Total..	2,250

The committee did not authorize the following project:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	Cost
Naval Security Group Detachment, Guam:	
Ocean surveillance building addition.................	2,150 1/

1/ Budget constraints

NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND

The committee did not authorize the following project:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	Cost
Navy Public Works Center, Subic Bay, RP:	
Facility energy improvements.........................	2,100 1/

1/ Budget constraints

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL RESEARCH

For the Office of the Chief of Naval Research outside the United States, the committee approved $3,730,000 for one project at the following location:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	Cost
Naval Underwater Systems Center, Andros Island, Bahamas:	
Civilian quarters	3,730
Total	3,730

VARIOUS LOCATIONS

The following projects are at various locations. The committee approved $263,545,000 for three projects.

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	Cost
Various:	
Defense access roads	5,400
Unspecified minor construction	114,375 1/
Architectural and engineering services	143,770

1/ Includes the estimated costs of all projects $2,000,000 or less with a $10,000,000 general reduction. Unspecified projects to be reprogrammed from this amount.

SUMMARY OF NAVY PROGRAM ACTIONS

A summary of actions taken of the request of the Navy is tabulated by projects as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	Cost
Navy request	1,795,380
US Marine Corps:	
Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, NC: Field maintenance complex	-5,900 1/
Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, CA:	
Training support center	-5,500 1/
Communications support storehouse	-2,650 1/
Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, CA:	
Runway extension	+14,400 2/
Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay HI: Combat Vehicle maintenance shop	-6,480 1/
Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, SC:	
Clothing issue facility	+2,630 2/
Bachelor officer quarters	+4,620 2/
Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, CA:	
Supply complex	-8,440 1/
Chief of Naval Operations:	
Commandant Naval District, Washington, DC:	
White House support complex	-24,000 3/
Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet:	
Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, FL: Aircraft acoustical enclosure	-4,910 1/
Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, FL; Helicopter training facility	-4,220 1/
Naval Air Station, Key West, FL: Hydrofoil berthng wharf	-8,490 1/
Naval Submarine Base, New London, CT:	
Weapons storage improvements	-2,950 1/
Bachelor officer quarters	-9,300 4/
Naval Station, New York, NY: Battleship support complex (increment II)	-6,000 1/
Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet:	
Naval Submarine Base, Bangor, WA: Security building	-2,750 1/

Naval Air Station, Barbers Point, HI: TACAMO support complex	-25,300 5/
Naval Amphibious Base, Coronado, CA: Operational storage warehouse	-3,720 1/
Naval Station, Everett, WA: Carrier support complex (increment II)	-10,000 1/
Naval Air Station, Fallon, NV: Electronic warfare range improvements	-4,000 7/
Naval Station, Long Beach, CA: Bachelor officer quarters	-3,730 4/
Naval Air Station, Miramar, CA; Consolidated brig	-22,500 6/
Chief of Naval Education and Training:	
Surface Warfare Officers School Command, Newport, RI:	
Surface warfare officer training facility	-8,840 1/
Naval Training Center, Orlando, FL:	
Advanced underwater weapons training facility	-2,950 1/
Public works shop	-2,550 1/
Naval Construction Training Center, Port Huemene, CA:	
Seabee fleet support training facilities	-3,240 1/
Naval Training Center, San Diego, CA: Bridge	-2,950 1/
Naval Technical Training Center, San Francisco, CA:	
Fire fighting trainer facility	-9,820 1/
Naval Supply Systems Command:	
Naval Supply Center, Oakland, CA: General warehouse addition and modernization	-2,950 1/
Naval Supply Center, Pearl Harbor, HI: Cold storage facility	-11,820 1/
Naval Supply Center, San Diego, CA:	
Railroad track relocation	-2,450 1/
Naval Facilities Engineering Command:	
Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, CA:	
Engineering support facility	-3,140 1/
Naval Sea Systems Command	
Naval Weapons Station, Charleston, SC:	
Consolidated brig	-16,500 6/
Naval Weapons Station, Earle, NJ:	
Ammunition pier and trestle	-20,000 8/
Naval Ordnance Station, Indian Head, MD: Propellant facilities upgrade	-3,680 1/
Naval Undersea Warfare Engineering Station, Keyport, WA:	
Missile magazines	-5,890 1/
Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, CA: Sewage treatment facility	+5,100 2/
Strategic Systems Project Office:	
Naval Submarine Base, Kings Bay, GA; TRIDENT support complex	-10,000 1/
Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet (outside the US):	
Naval Air Station, Keflavik IC: Fuel facilities	-13,300 9/
Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet (outside the US):	
Naval Air Facility, Atsugi, JA: Fire protection	+5,300 2/
Commander in Chief, US Naval Forces, Europe:	
Naval Support Activity, Naples, IT: Command, control communications and intelligence complex (phase I)	-18,000 6/
Naval Security Group Command (outside the US):	
Naval Security Group Detachment, Guam: Ocean surveillance building addition	-2,150 1/
Naval Facilities Engineering Command (outside the US):	
Navy Public Works Center, Subic Bay, RP: Facility energy improvements	-2,100 1/

Various locations:	
Minor construction..............................	-25,000 10/

Total military construction authorized for appropriation 1,497,310

1/ Budget constraints
2/ Committee add
3/ Insufficient design
4/ Use third party
5/ Use West Coast basing
6/ Not justified
7/ Repricing
8/ Phase Fund. $52,500,000 authorized - $32,500,000 authorized for appropriations.
9/ Not needed
10/ $10,000,000 general reduction. $15,000,000 reprogram unspecified requirements

FAMILY HOUSING

The Navy's request for the Family Housing program and the committee's recommendations are as follows:

NAVY FAMILY HOUSING

[In thousands of dollars]

Category	Request	Committee Change		Revised Total
Construction:				
New family housing (1,668 units and 300 mobile home spaces requested).....	176,742	-28,330	1/	148,412
Post acquisition construction/improvements	51,580	-25,000	2/	26,580
Architectural and Engineering Services..	2,000	0		2,000
Total construction....................	230,322	-53,330		176,992
Operation and maintenance (90,688 units):				
Operating Expenses.......................	262,915	-2,000	3/	260,915
Maintenance..............................	268,146	- 0		268,146
Total operation and maintenance......	531,061	-2,000		529,061
Leasing:				
Foreign (1923 units).....................	17,245	0		17,245
Domestic (665 units)..................	5,214	0		5,214
Total leasing........................	22,459	0		22,459
Debt payment:				
Principal................	8,613	0		8,613
Interest and other expenses.............	268	0		268
Servicemen's mortgage insurance premiums	190	0		190
Total debt payment...................	9,071	0		9,071
Total Navy family housing	792,913	-55,330		737,583

1/ Use third party for units at NS New York
2/ Use prior year authorization
3/ Repricing of furnishings account

NEW CONSTRUCTION

The committee approved $148,412,000 for 1,368 units of new construction and 300 mobile home spaces.

[In thousands of dollars]

Location	New Housing Units	Mobile Home Spaces	Cost
Naval Station, Long Beach, CA:	300		22,900
Naval Air Station, Moffett Field CA:........	126		11,600
Navy Public Works Center, San Francisco CA:.	300		26,450
Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center, Twentynine Palms, CA:......................	392	75	35,300
Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, CA:......		100	1,800
Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, NC:........		75	930
Marine Corps Development and Education Command, Quantico, VA:.....................		50	790
Naval Station Keflavik, IC:.................	250		48,642
	1,368	300	148,412

SUMMARY OF FAMILY HOUSING ACTIONS

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	Cost
Total request	792,913
Naval Station, New York, NY: 300 units	-28,330 1/
Post acquisition construction improvements	-25,000 2/
Furnishings account	- 2,000 3/
Total family housing authorized for appropriation	-737,583 4/

1/ Use third party
2/ Use prior year authorization
3/ Repricing

STRATEGIC HOMEPORTING

The committee has had an opportunity to extensively review the Secretary of the Navy's strategic homeporting initiative. This plan calls for dispersal of more than sixty ships from two carrier groups, three battleship groups and Naval Reserve Forces to twelve locations on the east, west and Gulf coasts of the United States and on Hawaii.

It is the judgement of the committee that the strategic value of this plan has been clearly demonstrated. The committee approves the homeporting plan at a 5-year construction cost of no more than $799 million dollars for military construction as outlined by the Secretary of the Navy in the "Military Necessity/Cost Effectiveness Report", dated November 1985.

The committee has no objection to the Secretary of the Navy obligating and expending funds appropriated in fiscal year 1986 for construction of facilities at Everett, Washington and Staten Island, New York.

Furthermore, the committee understands that the Navy actively encouraged contributions from the States and local communities to reduce the overall cost of its Strategic Homeporting Program and took into consideration the pledged contributions in selecting the sites of the new homeports. In response to the Navy's efforts, the States and local communities have pledged over $150 million toward offsetting facility construction and dredging costs, as well as land and various infrastructure support. In addition, several communities made commitments for providing assistance in obtaining third party financing for family housing.

The Navy is commended for its efforts in this area. To the maximum extent possible and deemed appropriate, the Secretary is instructed to insure State and local cost sharing for homeport construction. The committee, however, is concerned that prior and future commitments may not be fully realized, in which event, additional military construction funds would have to be appropriated to compensate for promised offsets. Therefore, the Secretary of the Navy must monitor the commitments that the States and local communities have and will make in order to insure that they live up to their obligations. In the event that the Secretary determines that the State or local community for a particular homeport is not fulfilling its required obligations, he should suspend activities in establishing that homeport and forthwith submit a full report to the authorizing committees, with recommendations for alternatives to that location.

BROADWAY COMPLEX, SAN DIEGO

This section authorizes the Navy to enter into long-term agreements for construction of a mixed-use office and commercial development on a Navy-owned site, known as the Broadway Complex, in San Diego, California.

Through a competitive process one or more developers will be selected to develop office space to meet the Navy's office space requirements at the Broadway Complex and in return the Navy will provide long-term land leases and development rights for certain portions of the site to the developers.

It is the committee's intent that the plans and conditions of development will be formulated by the Navy and the San Diego community through the Broadway Complex Coordinating Group of the San Diego Association of Governments. The plan and any subsequent changes will be submitted to Congress at least 21 days before any contracts can be entered into regarding development of the site.

TITLE III -- AIR FORCE

The Air Force requested authorization of $2,563,229,000. The committee after careful review and consideration of the Air Force request, approved authorization for appropriation of $2,229,889,000 for the following programs:

	Air Force request	Total authorization	Less amounts not authorized for appropriation	Total authorized for appropriation
Military Construction:				
Inside the United States.....	$ 993,032,000	$ 679,527,000	[1]-9,470,000	$ 670,057,000
Outside the United States....	533,828,000	331,143,000	[2]-4,000,000	327,143,000
Architectural and engineering services......................	127,260,000	127,260,000		127,260,000
Minor construction	-0-	228,320,000	[3]-10,000,000	218,320,000
Defense access roads..........	32,700,000	32,700,000		32,700,000
Unspecified minor construction	16,000,000	-0-		-0-
Total military construction authorization.............	1,702,820,000	1,398,950,000	-23,470,000	1,375,480,000
Military family housing:				
Construction.................	109,000,000	103,000,000		103,000,000
Support......................	751,409,000	751,409,000		751,409,000
Total family housing.......	860,409,000	854,409,000		854,409,000
Grand total Air Force......	2,563,229,000	2,253,359,000	-23,470,000	2,229,889,000

[1] Authorized to be accomplished with FY 86 and prior appropriated energy funds. Not authorized for appropriation.

[2] General reduction - Korea.

[3] General reduction - budget constraints.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, OVERVIEW

The Air Force's authorization request for the military construction program and the committee's recommendations are as follows:

MAJOR COMMAND SUMMARY
(In thousands of dollars)

Major command	Air Force Request	Committee approved
Inside the United States:		
Air Force Logistics Command...............	170,805	111,955
Air Force Systems Command.................	34,500	23,100
Air Training Command......................	60,160	51,400
Air University............................	8,210	2,900
Alaskan Air Command.......................	66,910	49,550

MAJOR COMMAND SUMMARY (Continued)
(In thousands of dollars)

Major command	Air Force Request	Committee approved
Military Airlift Command.................	113,425	34,100
Pacific Air Forces........................	5,850	0
Space Command.............................	22,150	13,750
Special Project...........................	37,056	37,056
Strategic Air Command.....................	277,016	205,766
Tactical Air Command......................	191,130	136,480
United States Air Force Academy...........	5,820	4,000
Total, inside the United States.......	993,032	670,057
Outside the United States:		
Military Airlift Command.................	17,050	15,750
Pacific Air Forces........................	146,845	110,500
Space Command.............................	17,950	16,410
Strategic Air Command.....................	7,600	0
Tactical Air Command......................	8,500	6,900
United States Air Forces in Europe......	335,883	181,583
General reduction - Korea................		-4,000
Total, outside the United States.....	533,828	327,143
Support :		
Unspecified minor construction..........	16,000	-0-
Minor construction........................	-0-	228,320
Architectural and engineering services..	127,260	127,260
Defense access roads.........................	32,700	32,700
General reduction to minor construction-budget constraints.................		-10,000
Total support..........................	175,960	348,280
Total military construction...................	1,702,820	1,375,480
Total family housing..........................	860,409	854,409
Grand total, Air Force...............	2,563,229	2,229,889

FACILITY CATEGORY SUMMARY
(In thousands of dollars)

Facility Category	Air Force request	Committee approved
Operational..................................	414,710	296,825
Training.....................................	70,930	49,670
Maintenance/production.......................	259,550	121,195
Research, development, test and evaluation..	47,310	47,170
Supply.......................................	147,250	81,850

FACILITY CATEGORY SUMMARY (Continued)
(In thousands of dollars)

Facility Category	Air Force request	Committee approved
Administrative	138,330	92,870
Personnel housing/community support	286,410	210,090
Personnel housing	(219,220)	(164,240)
Community support	(67,190)	(45,850)
Utilities	145,600	113,700
Water pollution abatement	7,300	7,300
Energy	9,470	0
Minor construction	16,000	218,320
Architectural and engineering services	127,260	127,260
Defense access roads	32,700	32,700
Subtotal military construction	1,670,120	1,375,480
Military family housing	860,409	854,409
Grand total, Air Force	2,563,229	2,229,889

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

The committee approved $5,800,000 for one pollution abatement project. The project is listed with the appropriate command's projects.

ENERGY CONSERVATION INVESTMENT PROGRAM

The Air Force had requested authorization and appropriation of $9,470,000 for nine ECIP projects. The Air Force is directed to use available prior year ECIP appropriation for these projects. The projects are authorized but authorization for appropriation is not being provided. Projects are as follows:

Location and project	Thousands
Davis Monthan Air Force Base, AZ:	
Alter heat/ventilation/air cond	230
Tyndall Air Force Base, FL:	
Facility energy improvements	600
Andrews Air Force Base, MD:	
Alter lighting systems	430
Wurtsmith Air Force Base, MI:	
Boiler improvements	320
Keesler Air Force Base, MS:	
Facility energy improvements	1,970
Offutt Air Force Base, NE:	
Facility energy improvements	2,680
Minot Air Force Base, ND:	
Alter heating systems	250
Langley Air Force Base, VA:	
Upgrade heating system	1,640
Fairchild Air Force Base, WA:	
Weatherization	1,350
Total	9,470

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AIR FORCE LOGISTICS COMMAND

The Air Force Logistics Command (AFLC) is responsible for providing an adequate and efficient system of procurement, production, surveillance, maintenance and supply for the United States Air Force and training specialized units for accomplishment of logistics functions in overseas areas and theaters.

The committee approved $111,955,000 for 15 projects at the following locations:

Location and project	Thousands
Hill Air Force Base, UT:	
Peacekeeper - system engineering test silo	4,000
Total	4,000
Kelly Air Force Base, TX:	
Weapons systems support center	39,000
Total	39,000
McClellan Air Force Base, CA:	
Depot flight instrument overhaul facility	9,400
Ammunition storage complex/land acquisition	4,300
Regional wastewater connection	5,800
Total	19,500
Newark Air Force Base, OH:	
Radiac Laboratory	3,000
Total	3,000

Location and project	Thousands
Robins Air Force Base, GA:	
Dangerous cargo pad	2,700
Add to and alter avionics repair facility	6,455
High density storage facilities	3,800
Total	12,955
Tinker Air Force Base, OK:	
Aircraft maintenance hangar	15,000
Add to and alter heat treatment facility	2,300
Total	17,300
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH:	
Add to and alter biocommunications laboratory	7,400
Add/alter aircraft fire protection explosion research lab	2,850
Road	3,600
Hangar fire protection system	2,350
Total	16,200

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location and project	Thousands
Hill AFB, UT: Logistics system operations center	11,500[1]
Kelly AFB, TX: Fuel systems accessories test facility	10,900[1]
McClellan AFB, CA: Add to and alter depot warehouse	9,400[1]
Tinker AFB, OK: Warehouse	10,800[1]
Wright-Patterson AFB, OH: Aircraft support equipment facility	3,300[1]

[1] Budget Constraints

AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND

The Air Force Systems Command (AFSC) is responsible for advancing aerospace technology, adapting it to operational aerospace systems, and acquiring quantitatively superior aerospace systems and material needed to accomplish the Air Force mission.

The committee approved $23,100,000 for 6 projects at the following locations:

Location and project	Thousands
Arnold Engineering Development Center, TN:	
Fire deficiency corrections	2,800
Total	2,800
Edwards Air Force Base, CA:	
Alter avionics shop	2,300
Add to and alter avionics research laboratory	7,200
Add to propellant laboratory complex	5,500
Total	15,000
Hanscom Air Force Base, MA:	
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	2,700
Total	2,700
Patrick Air Force Base, FL:	
Aircraft corrosion control facilities	2,600
Total	2,600

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location and project	Thousands
Eglin AFB, FL: Fuel systems maintenance facility	1,650[1]
Fort MacArthur, CA: Alter personnel support facility	3,000[2]

[1] Use $2,300 from prior year authorization.
[2] Budget constraints

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

The Air Training Command (ATC) is responsible for providing flying training leading to an aeronautical rating, aircrew training, basic and advanced technical training leading to an Air Force specialty, basic military training, mobile training, and other training as may be directed by the United States Air Force Chief of Staff.

The committee approved $51,400,000 for 7 projects at the following locations:

Location and project	Thousands
Chanute Air Force Base, IL:	
Weather training facility	8,700
Liquid fuels training facility	2,600
Total	11,300

Location and project	Thousands
Goodfellow Air Force Base, TX:	
Unaccompanied officer personnel housing	10,000
Total	10,000
Lackland Air Force Base, TX:	
Academic facility-security police	5,500
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	16,000
Total	21,500
Laughlin Air Force Base, TX:	
Land acquisition-auxiliary airfield	3,700
Total	3,700
Williams Air Force Base, AZ:	
Flight simulator research facility	4,900
Total	4,900

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location and project	Thousands
Keesler AFB, MS: ECIP-Facility energy improvements	1,970[1]
Randolph AFB, TX: Administrative facility (AFMEA)	2,250[2]
Williams AFB, AZ: Consolidated support facility	3,800[2]

[1] Use unobligated appropriations from prior ECIP projects

[2] Budget constraints

AIR UNIVERSITY

The Air University (AU) is responsible for Air Force professional military education. It also provides support for the Civil Air Patrol (CAP) and the Air Force Data System Design Center.

The committee approved $2,900,000 for one project at the following locations:

Location and project	Thousands
Gunter Air Force Station, AL:	
Alter electrical distribution system	2,900
Total	2,900

The committee did not authorize the following project:

Location and project	Thousands
Maxwell AFB, AL: Vehicle Maint Complex	3,100[1]

[1] Budget constraints

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

The Alaskan Air Command (AAC) is responsible for providing combat ready forces, defense weapons systems, aircraft control and warning element, and air defense forces within Alaska. It also is responsible for providing logistical support for the Strategic Air Command, the Military Airlift Command, the Command of the Alaska Sea Frontier and the United States Army.

The committee approved $49,550,000 for 10 projects at the following locations:

Location and project	Thousands
Eielson Air Force Base, AK:	
Hazardous materials storage	3,450
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	2,800
Fire protection - flightline	2,150
Loop access road	3,200
Total	11,600
Galena Airport, AK:	
Unaccompanied personnel housing	7,600
Add to and alter power plant	4,000
Total	11,600
King Salmon Airport, AK:	
Unaccompanied officer personnel housing	4,050
Total	4,050
Shemya Air Force Base, AK:	
Solid state uninterruptible power supply support	2,600
Diesel storage tanks	15,500
Add to and alter water system - phase I	4,200
Total	22,300

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location and project	Thousands
Eielson AFB, AK: Dining hall	5,700[1]
Library	2,500[1]
Elmendorf AFB, AK: Security police facility	5,000[1]

[1] Budget constraints

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

The Military Airlift Command (MAC) is responsible for maintaining the military airlift system in a constant state of readiness. MAC supervises and operates the Air Weather Service, the Air Rescue and Recovery Service, Aeromedical Evacuation System and Military Airlift.

The committee approved $34,100,000 for six projects at the following locations:

Location and project	Thousands
Charleston Air Force Base, SC:	
Corrosion control facility	5,000
Squadron operations building	1,200[1]
Total	6,200
Kirtland Air Force Base, NM:	
Optics and beam control laboratory	8,700
Total	8,700
McChord Air Force Base, WA:	
Add to and alter air freight terminal	6,400
Total	6,400
McGuire Air Force Base, NJ:	
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	7,000
Total	7,000
Pope Air Force Base, NC:	
Upgrade central heating plants	2,300
Total	2,300
Travis Air Force Base, CA:	
Physical fitness center	4,700
Total	4,700

[1] Added by the committee.

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location and project	Thousands
Andrews AFB, MD: AF-1 maintenance and support complex	45,000[1]
ECIP-alter lighting sytems	430[2]
Little Rock AFB, AR: Add to & alter fuel systems maint docks	2,750[3]
McChord AFB, WA: Squadron operations facility	4,900[3]
McGuire AFB, NJ: Add to and alter base civil engineering complex	5,700[3]

[1] Insufficient Design.
[2] Use unobligated appropriations from prior ECIP projects.
[3] Budget constraints.

The committee reduced the following project in the amount shown:

Location and project	Thousands
Scott AFB, IL: Add to and alter consolidated computer facility	7,800[1]

[1] Request of $8.9 million reduced by $7.8 million as prior authorization is available.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

The Pacific Air Forces are responsible for offensive and defensive air operations, and for providing administrative and logistical support for Air Force units in the Pacific geographical area.

The committee approved no projects for Pacific Air Command, inside the United States.

The committee did not authorize the following project:

Location and project	Thousands
Hickam AFB, HI:	
Add to and alter command center	4,700[1]

[1] Budget constraints

SPACE COMMAND

The Space Command is responsible for operational space assets and the strategic defense mission.

The committee approved $13,750,000 for three projects at the following locations:

Location and project	Thousands
Cape Cod Air Force Station, MA:	
Alter power plant	4,300
Total	4,300
Falcon Air Force Station, CO:	
Land acquisition	6,400
Total	6,400
Peterson Air Force Base, CO:	
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	3,050
Total	3,050

The committee did not authorize the following project:

Location and project	Thousands
Peterson AFB, CO: Base supply warehouse-phase I	4,000[1]

[1] Budget constraints

SPECIAL PROJECT

Authorization for a special project was requested.

The committee approved $37,056,000 for a special project at an unspecified location:

Location and project	Thousands
Unspecified Location: Special tactical facilities	37,056
Total	37,056

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

The Strategic Air Command (SAC) is responsible for the bomber, tanker and missile force required for conducting intensive and conclusive worldwide offensive operations.

The committee approved $205,766,000 for 27 projects at the following locations:

Location and project	Thousands
Beale Air Force Base, CA:	
U-2R-Shelter and apron	3,516
TR-1-Aircraft shelter/apron	4,000
Total	7,516
Ellsworth Air Force Base, SD:	
Control tower	2,150
STC-Range control and operational facility	5,500
Total	7,650
F.E. Warren Air Force Base, WY:	
Peacekeeper-Launch facilities site work	3,400
Add to and alter energy monitoring/control system	2,600
Total	6,000
Fairchild Air Force Base, WA:	
Security police operations facility	2,900
Total	2,900
Grand Forks Air Force Base, ND:	
B-1B-Support Complex	12,940
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	4,100
Total	17,040
Grissom Air Force Base, IN:	
Mission operations facility	3,000
Total	3,000
La Junta, CO:	
Strategic training range site-composite support facilities	2,150
Total	2,150
Loring Air Force Base, ME:	
Acft parking apron-hydrant fueling system w/CASS provision-Ph I	12,200
Total	12,200
Malmstrom Air Force Base, MT:	
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	3,800
KC-135R-Support Complex	26,970
Total	30,770
March Air Force Base, CA:	
KC-10-Hydrant fueling-Central aircraft support system	13,600
Total	13,600

Location and project	Thousands
McConnell Air Force Base, KS:	
B-1B-Support Complex	30,160
KC-135-Hydrant fueling system	2,600
Total	32,760
Minot Air Force Base, ND:	
CM-Support Complex	22,010
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	4,650
Total	26,660
Offutt Air Force Base, NE:	
Strategic analysis and applications center	12,350
Add to and alter strategic comm division headquarters fac	2,470
Electrical substation	4,450
Security improvements	2,500
Total	21,770
Vandenberg Air Force Base, CA:	
Add to and alter Oak Mountain power plant	2,700
Total	2,700
Whiteman Air Force Base, MO:	
Alter electrical distribution system	9,500
Total	9,500
Wurtsmith Air Force Base, MI:	
B-52-Support Complex	9,550
Total	9,550

The committee reduced the following projects by the amounts shown:

Location and project	Thousands
Malmstrom AFB, MT: KC-135 Support complex - General reduction	3,000[1]
F.E. Warren AFB, WY: Peacekeeper - Launch facilities site work	1,600[2]
Grand Forks AFB, ND: B-1B Support complex-General reduction	2,400[1]
McConnell AFB, KS: B-1B Support complex - General reduction	2,000[1]
Minot AFB, ND: CM Support complex - General reduction	3,000[1]
Wurtsmith AFB, MI: B-52 Support complex - General reduction	1,000[1]

[1] Budget constraints.

[2] Repricing.

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location and project	Thousands
Blytheville AFB, AR: Alter taxiways	2,000[1]
Minot AFB, ND: ECIP-Alter Heating Systems	250[2]
Offutt AFB, NE: ECIP-Facility energy improvements	2,680[2]
Plattsburgh AFB, NY: ADAL Vehicle Maint	3,200[1]
Alter UEPH	3,000[1]
Wurtsmith AFB, MI: ECIP-Boiler Improvements	320[2]

[1] Budget constraints.

[2] Use unobligated appropriations from prior ECIP projects.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

The Tactical Air Command (TAC) is responsible for tactical air operations and strategic defense of the United States.

The committee approved $136,480,000 for 32 projects at the following locations:

Location and project	Thousands
Base 39, Classified Location, ZI:	
F-15E-Flight simulator	2,300
Total	2,300
Bergstrom Air Force Base, TX:	
Tactical air control center facility	3,390
Total	3,390
Cannon Air Force Base, NM:	
Small Aircraft Maintenance Dock	4,700[1]
Aircraft Fuel Systems Maintenance Dock	2,550[1]
Total	7,250
Davis Monthan Air Force Base, AZ:	
Aircraft processing apron (MASDC)	3,400
Control tower	2,400
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	5,300
Total	11,100
George Air Force Base, CA:	
Resource management facility	7,650
Total	7,650
Holloman Air Force Base, NM:	
Tactical operations center	3,350
Radar target scatter modernization-phase II	4,160
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	4,500
Land Acquisition	2,150
Total	14,160
Homestead Air Force Base, FL:	
Dining hall and troop issue facility	3,400
Total	3,400
Langley Air Force Base, VA:	
Base supply complex-Phase III	4,450
Add to and alter data processing facility	3,550
Total	8,000
Luke Air Force Base, AZ:	
F-15E-Squadron Ops	3,100
F-15E-ADAL Flight Simulator Facility	7,200
F-15E-Field Training Detach	2,800
Small aircraft maintenance docks	6,360
Total	19,480

Location and project	Thousands
Mountain Home Air Force BAse, ID:	
Combat support center	8,700
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing (OTH-B)	4,000
Total	12,700
Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, SC:	
Aircraft corrosion control facilities	3,000
Total	3,000
Nellis Air Force Base, NV:	
Parallel taxiway/land acquisition	7,300
Combat support center	6,200
Dining hall	2,600
Total	16,100
Shaw Air Force Base, SC:	
Add to and alter 9th Air Force headquarters	3,700
Total	3,700
Tyndall Air Force Base, FL:	
F-15 Add to Aircraft Apron	9,300
F-15 UEPH	4,650
Total	13,950
West Conus, ZI:	
OTH-B Radar transmitter standby power line	7,500
OTH-B Radar transmitter and receiver support facilities	2,800
Total	10,300

[1] Added by the committee.

The committee reduced the following project by the amount shown:

Location and project	Thousands
West Conus, ZI: OTH-B Radar transmitter standby power line	10,500[1]

[1] Repricing.

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location and project	Thousands
Avon Park: Extend Runway	4,100[1]
Davis Monthan AFB, AZ: Base civil engineer administrative fac	2,600[1]
ECIP-Alter Heat/Vent etc	230[2]
England AFB, LA: Base civil engineer administrative facility	2,300[1]
George AFB, CA: Visiting personnel quarters	5,000[1]
Langley AFB, VA: ECIP-Upgrade heating systems	1,640[2]
MacDill AFB, FL: Base Contracting Facility	1,350[1]
Nellis AFB, NV: BCE Complex	7,700[1]
Seymour-Johnson AFB, SC: Aircraft maintenance supply warehouse	2,100[1]
Tyndall AFB, FL: ECIP-Facility energy improvements	600[2]

[1] Budget constraints
[2] Use unobligated appropriations from prior ECIP projects

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The United States Air Force Academy is responsible for educating and training young men and women to become officers in the U.S. Air Force.

The committee approved $4,000,000 for one project at the following location:

Location and project	Thousands
United States Air Force Academy, CO:	
Alter electrical distribution system	4,000
Total	4,000

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

The Military Airlift Command (MAC) is responsible for maintaining the military airlift system in a constant state of readiness. MAC supervises and operates the Air Weather Service, the Air Rescue and Recovery Service, Aeromedical Evacuation System and Military Airlift.

The committee approved $15,750,000 for three projects at the following locations:

Location and project	Thousands
Lajes Field, PO:	
Hydrant refueling system	8,300
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	4,750
Unaccompanied officer personnel housing	2,700
Total	15,750

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

The Pacific Air Forces are responsible for offensive and defensive air operations, and for providing administrative and logistical support for Air Force units in the Pacific geographical area.

The committee approved $110,500,000 for 18 projects at the following locations:

Location and project	Thousands
Clark Air Base, RP:	
Parallel runway	32,500
Cope Thunder operations facility	4,650
Essential maintenance facilities-phase II	4,600
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	5,000
Upgrade power plant-phase IV	8,600
Total	55,350
Kadena Air Base, JA:	
Add to and alter hydrant refueling system-phase II	7,100
Total	7,100
Kimhae Air Base, KO:	
Unaccompanied personnel housing	3,050
Total	3,050

Location and project	Thousands
Kunsan Air Base, KO:	
Aircraft maintenance management facility	2,050
Alter electrical distribution system-phase II	2,600
Total	4,650
Misawa Air Base, JA:	
Concrete arch igloo magazines	3,050
Munitions preload complex	7,250
Total	10,300
Osan Air Base, KO:	
Munitions maintenance and storage facilities-phase II	5,950
Aircraft maintenance facilities	3,000
Add to and alter primary electrical distribution system	5,400
Total	14,350
Saipan, MI:	
PACBAR radar barrier III	5,200
Total	5,200
Suwon Air Base, KO:	
Munitions maintenance and storage facilities	3,250
Total	3,250
Taegu Air Base, KO:	
Airmen dining hall	2,350
Total	2,350
Yokota Air Base, JA:	
Jet fuel storage	4,900
Total	4,900

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location and project	Thousands
Camp Humphreys, KO: Operational, maintenance and storage facilities	8,300[1]
Diego Garcia Air Base, IO: Global positioning system internet fac	3,900[1]
Vehicle storage and maintenance support	800[1]
Osan AB, KO: Chapel center	2,300[1]
General reduction, Korea	-4,000[1]

[1] Budget constraints

SPACE COMMAND

The Space Command is responsible for operational space assets and the strategic defense mission.

The committee approved $16,410,000 for six projects at the following locations:

Location and project	Thousands
Sondrestrom Air Base, GL:	
Unaccompanied personnel housing	5,860
Total	5,860
Thule Air Base, GL:	
Fire station	3,900
Solid state uninterruptible power supply support	2,150
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	2,200
Total	8,250
Woomera Air Station, AU:	
Solid state uninterruptible power supply support	2,300
Total	2,300

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

The Committee did not approve any projects for Strategic Air Command outside the United States.

The Committee did not authorize the following project because of budget constraints:

Andersen AFB, GU	
Alter jet fuel storage facilities	7,600

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

The Tactical Air Command (TAC) is responsible for tactical air operations and strategic defense of the United States.

The committee approved $6,900,000 for two projects at the following locations:

Location and project	Thousands
Masirah, OM:	
SW Asia-Caretaker contractor support facilities	3,500
Total	3,500
Thumrait, OM:	
SW Asia-Caretaker contractor support facilities	3,400
Total	3,400

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

The U.S. Air Forces in Europe (USAFE) are responsible for offensive and defensive air operations in Europe and in other areas not included in either the NATO or U.S. Commander-in-Chief Europe area of responsibilities.

The committee approved $181,583,000 for 39 projects at the following locations:

Location and project	Thousands
Alconbury Royal Air Force Base, UK:	
GLCM-Consolidated support center	8,800
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personanel housing	2,450
GLCM-Add to and alter physical training facility	2,100
Total	13,350
Ankara Air Base, TU:	
Consolidated support center	3,050
Total	3,050
Aviano Air Base, IT:	
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	4,200
Total	4,200
Base 30, Classified Location, OS:	
TR-1-Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	2,950
Total	2,950
Bentwaters Royal Air Force Base, UK:	
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	3,700
Total	3,700
Classified Location, OS:	
Storage facilities	11,500
Total	11,500
Fairford Royal Air Force Base, UK:	
Organizational maintenance and support equipment complex	2,750
Total	2,750
Hahn Air Base, GE:	
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	2,300
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	4,000
Total	6,300
Incirlik Air Base, TU:	
Vehicle maintenance complex	4,800
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	2,250
Dining hall	2,350
Visiting officer quarters	3,400
Total	12,800
Mildenhall Royal Air Force Base, UK:	
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	4,700
Total	4,700
Pirinclik, TU:	
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	3,000
Total	3,000

Location and project	Thousands
Ramstein Air Base, GE:	
F-16-Central security control facility	2,050
F-16-Munitions load crew training facility	2,350
F-16-Warehouse	2,200
Protected combat targeting center	36,000
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	6,300
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	3,000
Water storage tank	2,600
Total	54,500
San Vito Air Station, IT:	
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	3,300
Total	3,300
Sembach Air Base, GE:	
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	4,900
C-130-Central security control	2,200
Total	7,100
Spangdahlem Air Base, GE:	
Vehicle maintenance facility	2,350
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	3,700
Total	6,050
Upper Heyford Royal Air Force Base, UK:	
Add to and alter vehicle maintenance shop	2,300
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	4,500
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	6,000
Total	12,800
Various Locations, OS:	
Auxiliary seismic network	3,953
Total	3,953
Woensdrecht Air Base, NL:	
GLCM-Base civil engineer complex	3,500
GLCM-Base supply complex	2,350
GLCM-Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	7,300
GLCM-Unaccompanied officer personnel housing	3,000
GLCM-Utilities, pavements and roads	8,600
Total	22,830
Zweibrucken Air Base, GE:	
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	2,750
Total	2,750

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location and project	Thousands
Alconbury Royal Air Force Base, UK: GLCM-Base theater	1,300[1]
Bentwaters Royal Air Force Base, UK: Recreation center	2,250[1]
Camp New Amsterdam, NL: Add to base supply complex	2,450[2]

Location and project	Thousands
Comiso AB, IT: GLCM-Arts & Crafts	371[1]
GLCM-Auto Hobby Shop	410[1]
Florennes AB, GE: GLCM-Commissary	3,500[1]
GLCM-Auto Hobby Shop	520[1]
GLCM-Exchange complex	2,850[1]
GLCM-Youth Center	750[1]
Greenham Common Royal Air Force Base, UK: GLCM-Temp living fac.	2,100[2]
Hahn AB, GE: Alternate launch/recovery surface (ALRS)	2,100[2]
Morocco: Petroleum resupply system	25,400[3]
Ramstein Air Base, GE: Alter unaccompanied enlisted pers house.	2,900[2]
Add to and alter vehicle maintenance shop	6,000[2]
Visiting officers quarters	3,000[2]
San Vito Air Station: Visiting officers quarters	2,450[2]
Woensdrecht Air Base, NL: GLCM-Dining hall	1,600[4]
GLCM-Unaccomp Enlisted Pers Housing	1,920[5]
Woodbridge Royal Air Force Base, UK: Corrosion control facility.	3,400[2]
Zweibrucken Air Base, GE: Alternate launch and recovery surface.	3,550[2]

[1] Use nonappropriated funds
[2] Budget constraints
[3] Country Agreements Incomplete
[4] Use prior year funding
[5] Reduce scope by 120 persons. Use prior year funding.

SUPPORT ACTIVITIES

The support activities include resources for accomplishing design work on fiscal year 1987, 1988, 1989 and subsequent year's military construction projects, for unspecified minor construction and for accomplishing urgent requirements anticipated to arise during fiscal year 1987.

The committee approved $345,580,000 for the following elements of the support program:

Location and project	Thousands
Various locations, worldwide:	
Architectural and engineering services	127,260
Minor construction	228,320
Minor Construction, General reduction	-10,000
Total	345,580

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location and project	Thousands
Various Locations, Worldwide - Unspecified minor construction	16,000

DEFENSE ACCESS ROADS

The Air Force requested 32,700,000 for their portion of the Defense Access Roads account at the following installations:

Location and project	Thousands
F.E. Warren Air Force Base, WY: Peacekeeper-Access road	14,500
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH: Access road	15,000
Keesler Air Force Base, MI: Access road	3,200
Total	32,700

MINOR CONSTRUCTION

The committee denied $16,000,000 requested for unspecified minor construction and approved a $218,320,000 package for minor construction projects costing $2,000,000 or less.

SUMMARY OF AIR FORCE CHANGES

A summary of the committee recommendations by project is as follows:

Location and project	Thousands
Military construction: Total Air Force authorization request	1,702,820
Committee actions:	
Air Force Logistics Command:	
Hill AFB, UT: Logistics systems operations center	-11,500
Kelly AFB, TX: Fuel systems accessories test facility	-10,900
McClellan AFB, CA: Add to and alter depot warehouse	-9,400
Tinker AFB, OK: Warehouse	-10,800
Wright-Patterson AFB, OH: Acft support equipment fac	-3,300
Air Force Systems Command:	
Eglin AFB, FL: Fuel systems maintenance facility	-1,650
Fort MacArthur, CA: Alter personnel support facility	-3,000
Air Training Command:	
Keesler AFB, MS: ECIP-Facility energy improvements	-1,970
Randolph AFB, TX: Administrative facility (AFMEA)	-2,250
Williams AFB, AZ: Consolidated support facility	-3,800
Air University:	
Maxwell AFB, AL: Vehicle maintenance complex	-3,100
Alaskan Air Command:	
Eielson AFB, AK: Dining hall	-5,700
Library	-2,500
Elemendorf AFB, AK: Security police facility	-5,000
Military Airlift Command:	
Andrews AFB, MD: AF-1 Maintenance and support complex	-45,000
ECIP-Alter lighting systems	-430
Charleston AFB, SC: Squadron operations building	+1,200
Little Rock AFB, AR: ADAL fuel systems maint docks	-2,750
McChord AFB, WA: Squadron operations facility	-4,900
McGuire AFB, NJ: ADAL base civil engineering complex	-5,700
Scott AFB, IL: ADAL Consolidated computer facility	-7,800
Pacific Air Forces:	
Hickam AFB, HI: Add to and alter command center	-4,700
Space Command:	
Peterson AFB, CO: Base supply warehouse-phase I	-4,000
Strategic Air Command:	
Blytheville AFB, AR: Alter taxiways	-2,000
F.E. Warren AFB, WY: Peacekeeper-Launch fac site work	-1,600
Fairchild AFB, WA: ECIP-Weatherization	-1,350
Grand Forks AFB, ND: B-1B spt complex-general reduction	-2,400
Malmstrom AFB, MT: KC-135 Spt Complex-general reduction	-3,000
McConnell AFB, KS: B-1B Spt complex-general reduction	-2,000
Minot AFB, ND: CM support complex-general reduction	-3,000
ECIP-Alter heating systems	-250
Offutt AFB, NE: ECIP-Facility energy improvements	-2,680
Plattsburgh AFB, NY: ADAL vehicle maintenance shop	-3,200
Alter Unaccomp Enlist Personel Hsq	-3,000
Wurtsmith AFB, MI: B-52 Spt Complex-general reduction	-1,000
ECIP-Boiler improvements	-320

Location and project	Thousands
Tactical Air command:	
Avon Park, FL: Extend runway	-4,100
Cannon AFB, NM: Small aircraft maintenance dock	+4,700
Aircraft fuel systems maintenance dock.	+2,550
Davis Monthan AFB, AZ: BCE administrative facility	-2,600
ECIP-Alter heat/vent/air condit.	-230
England AFB, LA: BCE Administrative facility	-2,300
George AFB, CA: Visiting personnel quarters	-5,000
Langley AFB, VA: ECIP-Upgrade heating systems	-1,640
MacDill AFB, FL: Base contracting facility	-1,350
Nellis AFB, NV: Base engineering complex-phase I	-7,700
Seymour-Johnson AFB, SC: Acft maint supply warehouse	-2,100
Tyndall AFB, FL: ECIP-Facility energy improvements	-600
West Conus: OTH-B Radar Transmitter standby power line.	-10,500
Pacific Air Forces (Outside the United States):	
Camp Humphreys, KO: Operationsal, maint & storage facs.	-8,300
Diego Garcia AB, IO: Global positionsystem internet fac	-3,900
Vehicle storage & maint support	-800
Osan AB, KO: Chapel center	-2,300
Korea, Various Locations: General reduction	-4,000
Strategic Air Command:	
Andersen AFB, GQ: Alter jet fuel storage fac	-7,600
U.S. Air Forces in Europe:	
Alconbury RAF, UK: GLCM-Base theater	-1,300
Bentwaters RAF, UK: Recreation center	-2,250
Camp New Amsterdam, NL: Add to base supply complex	-2,450
Comiso AB, IT: GLCM-Arts and crafts shop	-370
GLCM-Automotive hobby shop	-410
Florennes AB, BE: GLCM-Commissary	-3,500
GLCM-Exchange complex	-2,850
GLCM-Automotive hobby shop	-520
GLCM-Youth center	-750
Greenham Common RAF, UK: GLCM-Temporary living fac	-2,100
Hahn AB, GE: Alternate launch/recovery surface (ALRS)	-2,100
Morocco: Petroleum resupply system	-25,400
Ramstein AB, GE: ADAL vehicle maintenance shops	-6,000
Alter unaccompanied enlist pers hsq	-2,900
Visiting officers quarters	-3,000
San Vito AS, IT: Visiting officers quarters	-2,450
Woensdrecht AB, NL: Unaccompanied enlist pers hsq	-1,920
GLCM-dining hall	-1,600
Woodbridge RAF, UK: Corrossion control facility	-3,400
Zweibrucken AB, GE: Alternate launched recovery surface	-3,550
Support:	
Unspecified minor construction	-16,000
Minor construction - general reduction	-10,000
Total military construction authorization for appropriations	1,375,480

FAMILY HOUSING

The Air Force's request for the Family Housing program and the committee's recommendations are as follows:

AIR FORCE FAMILY HOUSING
(in thousands of dollars)

Category	Air Force request	Committee approved
Construction:		
New family housing (523 units requested)	43,356	43,356
Post acquisition	58,644	52,644
Architect and engineer services	7,000	7,000
Total Construction	109,000	103,000
Operation and maintenance:		
Operating expenses	356,584	356,584
Maintenance	307,684	307,684
Total operation and maintenance	664,268	664,268
Leasing:		
Foreign	74,176	74,176
Domestic	5,600	5,600
Total leasing	79,776	79,776
Debt payment:		
Principal	6,909	6,909
Interest and other expenses	206	206
Servicemen's mortgage insurance premiums	250	250
Total debt payment	7,365	7,365
Total Air Force housing request	860,409	854,409
Total authorized for appropriation		854,409

NEW CONSTRUCTION

Family Housing new construction is intended to reduce the housing deficit where the private community does not provide sufficient adequate housing to support the Air Force mission. The committee approved $43,356,000 for nine projects (523 units) at the following locations:

Location	Project units	Cost(thousands)
La Junta Air Force Station, CO	40	4,000
Bitburg Air Base, Germany	332	26,415
Hahn Air Base, Germany	150	11,300
Osan Air Base, Korea	1	160
Beale Air Force Base, CA	*	180
Davis Monthan Air Force Base, AZ	**	300
McGuire Air Force Base, NJ	**	325

Location	Project units	Cost(thousands)
Pope Air Force Base, NC....................	**	300
Edwards Air Force Base, CA ***............	24	376

* Family Housing Maintenance Shop (support)
** Family Housing Office (support)
*** Mobile Home Park (pads)

POST ACQUISITION CONSTRUCTION

The committee approved $52,644,000 for 55 projects at various locations, including 23 projects where the per unit cost for improvement and repair exceeds the statutory limitation ($30,000 times the area cost factor).

ARCHITECT AND ENGINEER SERVICES

The committee approved $7,000,000 for planning and design work on fiscal year 1987 and future year military family housing construction projects, both new and post acquisition.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

The committee approved $654,268,000 for family housing operations and maintenance. Reimbursements are anticipated to be $18,000,000.

LEASING

The committee approved $74,176,000 for foreign leases and $5,600,000 for domestic leases.

DEBT PAYMENT

The committee approved $7,365,000 for principal and interest payments on mortgaged Capehart and Wherry housing units and Servicemen's Mortgage Insurance premiums.

SUMMARY OF FAMILY HOUSING ACTIONS

	Thousands
Authorization request..	$860,409
Unspecified construction improvements....................	-6,000
Subtotal reductions..................................	6,000
Total authorization for appropriations...............	854,409

MYRTLE BEACH AIR FORCE BASE

The committee directs the Department of the Air Force to design the Combat Support Center to meet a critical Air Force need.

TITLE IV - DEFENSE AGENCIES

The administration requested authorization of $566,400,000. The committee approved $461,690,000 for the following programs.

(In thousands of dollars)

	Defense agencies request	Total authorization	Plus amounts authorized for appropriations	Total authorized for appropriation
Military construction:				
Inside the United States	241,160	189,710	125,800[1]	315,510
Outside the United States	166,540	100,330		100,330
Planning and design	110.700	100,700		100,700
Unspecified minor construction[2]	4,000	0		0
Minor construction[2]	0	31,950		31,950
Secretary of Defense contingency	5,000	5,000		5,000
Conforming storage facilities	21,400	16,400		16,400
Total MILCON authorized	548,800	444,090	125,800	569,890
Military family housing:				
Construction, improvements, and design	270	270		270
Support	17,330	17,330		17,330
Total family housing	17,600	17,600		17,600
Grand total:				
Defense agencies	566,400	461,690	125,800	587,490

[1] $72,100,000 for Madigan Army Medical Center, $53,700,000 for R&D Facility at Ft Meade.

[2] A new category is established to fund all projects costing $2,000,000 or less from the minor construction account without specifying location. Funds approved for unspecified minor construction are included in this category.

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM

The Secretary of Defense's military construction request for the Defense agencies totaled $566,400,000 for fiscal year 1987. Included in this total are: $429,100,000 for major construction of new facilities and modernization or rehabilitation of existing facilities at 49 locations within the United States and at 34 locations overseas; $5,000,000 for contingency construction authorization for the Secretary of Defense to provide for unforeseen construction requirements in emergency situations; $110,700,000 for planning and design; $4,000,000 for unspecified minor construction projects, $270,000 for family housing construction and improvements; and $17,330,000 for family housing support.

The committee gave careful consideration to all projects and related support. The following table summarizes the authorization requested and approved:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Fiscal Year 1987 request	Committee approved
Defense Logistics Agency	60,850	47,830

Defense Mapping Agency	16,700	16,700
National Security Agency	17,570	16,570
Defense Medical Facilities Office	177,400	116,750
Secretary of Defense activities	6,400	9,000
Defense Communications Agency	9,900	9,900
Defense Language Institute	5,400	5,400
Defense Nuclear Agency	4,890	3,200
Joint Tactical C3 Agency	9,890	9,890
Strategic Defense Initiative	10,300	7,030
Department of Defense Dependents Schools	109,800	64,170
Overseas	(92,420)	(64,170)
Section 6	(17,380)	(0)
OSD contingency construction	5,000	5,000
Minor construction	4,000	31,950
Planning and design	110,700	100,700
Family housing	17,600	17,600
New construction and improvements	(270)	(270)
Support	(17,330)	(17,330)
Total	566,400	461,690

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY

The mission of the Defense Logistics Agency is to provide services and supplies used in common by all of the military services. The agency provides support in the areas of supply, contract administration, technical services, and property disposal to the military services, Federal agencies and certain foreign governments.

Also, the agency will carry-out the construction of hazardous waste storage facilities at various, unspecified locations. The committee reduced the request by $5,000,000 because of budget constraints and approved $16,400,000 for these projects.

The committee approved $31,430,000 for five projects at the following locations:

(In thousands of dollars)

Location	Project	Cost
Defense Fuel Supply Point:		
Charleston, SC	Fuel tankage	5,130
Mukilteo, WA	Fuel pier	6,360
Chimu Wan, Japan	Fuel tankage	6,640
Tsurumi, Japan	Fuel tankage	3,520
Defense Depot:		
Ogden, UT	Administrative facilities	9,780

DEFENSE MAPPING AGENCY

The mission of the Defense Mapping Agency is to acquire or develop and supply maps, charts, and other geodetic information required by the Department of Defense.

The committee approved $16,700,000 for one project at the following location:

ABLE

(In thousands of dollars)

Location	Project	Cost
Aerospace Center St Louis, MO	Digital production facilities	16,700

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

The mission of the National Security Agency is to organize, and manage activities and facilities for the production of foreign intelligence information.

The committee approved $16,570,000 for four projects at the following locations:

(In thousands of dollars)

Location	Project	Cost
Fort George G. Meade, MD	Connector road	5,200
	Road improvements	4,370
Classified location	Classified project	3,000
Classified location	Classified project	4,000

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

The committee approved $108,590,000 for various activities of the Office of the Secretary of Defense including one classified projects; 13 projects for overseas dependents schools; one project for the Defense Logistics Agency; two projects for the Defense Communications Agency; one project for the Joint Tactical Command, Control, and Communications Agency; two projects for the Strategic Defense Agency; and one additional project for the clean-up of ground water at the Rocky Mountain Arsenal.

The committee approved the following projects:

(In thousands of dollars)

Location	Project	Cost
Classified location	Classified project	3,000
Office of Dependents Schools:		
Bermuda	Elementary school	4,280
Aschaffenburg, Germany	Elementary/junior high school	6,600
Dexheim, Germany	Elementary school addition	2,430
Erlangen, Germany	Elementary school addition	3,220
Grafenwoehr, Germany	Elementary school addition	2,500
Hahn, Germany	High school addition	3,470
Heidelberg, Germany	Elementary and high school	3,190
Hessisch-Oldendorf, Germany	Elementary school	2,310
Kaiserslautern, Germany	Elementary and high school	7,880
Nuernberg, Germany	Elementary school addition	8,580
Stuttgart, Germany	Elementary/junior high school	4,530
Wuerzburg, Germany	Middle school	7,760
Woensdrecht, Netherlands	Elementary/high school addition	7,420

Defense Language Institute Monterey, CA	Barracks	5,400
Defense Communications Agency Scott AFB, IL	Computer center/administration facility	7,600
Pentagon, VA	Pentagon alteration/addition	2,300
Defense Nuclear Agency NRL Washington, DC	Pulse power research facility	3,200
Joint Tactical Command, Control, and Communications Agency Fort Huachucha, AZ	Communications test facility	9,890
Strategic Defense Initiative Edwards Air Force Base, CA	Rocket propulsion beryllium facility	4,140
Pacific Missile Range Kauai, HI	Intermediate ballistic missile facility	2,890
Environmental Restoration Rocky Mountain Arsenal, CO	Ground water treatment facility	6,000

DEFENSE MEDICAL FACILITIES OFFICE

The mission of the Defense Medical Facilities Office is to provide adequate and needed medical care for the military community served. The committee approved $116,750,000 for 15 projects.

(In thousands of dollars)

Location	Project	Cost
Edwards AFB, CA	Dental clinic	3,950
Pearl Harbor, HI	Occupational health clinic	9,700
Mountain Home AFB, ID	Composite medical facility	30,500
Ft. Polk, LA	Troop medical facility	2,650
Keesler AFB, MS	Add to/alter composite medical facility	3,100
McGuire AFB, NJ	Dental clinic	3,800
Kirtland AFB, NM	Add to/alter composite medical facility	16,000
Camp LeJeune, NC	Medical & dental facility clinic	3,900
Fort Hood, TX	Troop medical clinic	3,450
Randolph AFB, TX	Clinic/dental clinic	13,700
Boeblingen, Germany	Dispensary and dental clinic	3,650
Grafenwoehr, Germany	Dispensary and dental clinic	3,950
Karlsruhe, Germany	Dispensary and dental clinic	6,800
Vilseck, Germany	Dispensary and dental clinic	5,600
Camp New Amsterdam, Netherlands	Clinic/dental clinic	6,000

The committee did not approve the following projects:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location	Project	Cost
Fort McClellan, AL	Elementary school addition	2,830[1]
Fort Wainwright, AK	Troop medical and dental clinic	8,800[2]
Fort Ord, CA	Hospital addition	530[2]

March AFB, CA	Add/alter medical logistics facility	2,350[2]
Vandenberg AFB, CA	Add/alter medical center clinic annex	1,900[2]
Fort Benning, GA	White elementary school modernization	1,080[1]
Robins AFB, GA	Robins and Linwood elementary school	2,440[1]
Fort Campbell, KY	Middle school addition	1,340[1]
Fort Knox, KY	Six elementary schools gyms	4,350[1]
Andrews AFB, MD	Alter medical center clinic	2,000[2]
Governors Island, NY	Elementary/junior high school addition and roof repair	2,600[1]
Camp Lejeune, NC	Tarawa terrace/stone street/delalip elementary school addition	1,190[1]
Dalhgren, VA	Elementary/junior high school	1,130[1]
Pentagon, VA	Demolition of parking lot	2,500[2]
Quantico, VA	High school addition	420[1]
Naples, IT	Elementary and high school	19,950[3]
	Replacement hospital	29,300[3]

---

[1] Pending the review of the DoD plan for returning the schools to local school boards.

[2] Budget constraints.

[3] Not justified.

The committee reduced the following items for budget constraints

Location	Project	Amount
Worldwide	Planning and Design	10,000
General Reduction	Minor Construction	3,000

CONTINGENCY CONSTRUCTION

The committee approved the $5,000,000 requested in new authorization for unforeseen contingency construction reuirements. The committee feels this amount is adequate in view of the present balance in this account.

MINOR CONSTRUCTION

The committee approved $31,950,000 for minor construction projects. This is considered adequate to enable the numerous Defense Agencies and Activities to react to requirements resulting from unforeseen situations which could affect mission performance or safety of life or property, and to take advantage of opportunities to attain greater efficiency of operations. Also, this includes all projects estimated to cost $2,000,000 or less.

PLANNING AND DESIGN

The committee approved $100,700,000 for planning and design to support the timely design of Defense Agency projects proposed for inclusion in this and outyear programs.

FAMILY HOUSING

The committee approved the $17,600,000 requested for Military Family Housing to support the Defense Agencies.

FAMILY HOUSING - DEFENSE AGENCIES

(In thousands of dollars)

	Defense Mapping Agency	Defense Intelligence Agency	National Security Agency	Defense Logistics Agency	Total
New Construction			270		270
Operation	24	1,993	578	199	2,794
Leasing	35	8,341	5,651		14,027
Maintenance	32		245	232	509
Total	91	10,334	6,744	431	17,600

The FY 1987 Defense agency family housing request for construction is reduced from prior levels. New construction consists of only 3 units as opposed to the FY 1986 program that provided for 20 units. There are no family housing improvements requested.

SUMMARY OF DEFENSE AGENCIES PROGRAM ACTION

	Thousands
Total defense agency authorization request	$566,400
Regular Military Construction authorization request	548,800
Committee reductions	-110,710
Committee additions	+ 6,000
New military construction authorization	$444,090
Family housing authorization request	17,600
New family housing authorization	17,600
New Defense agency military construction and family housing authorization	$461,690

ROCKY MOUNTAIN ARSENAL

The purpose of this section is to provide interim authority to the Secretary of the Army to transfer funds to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency for response measures with regard to contaminated drinking water in south Adams County and for other purposes.

The Environmental Protection Agency has identified the presence of elevated concentrations of trichloroethylene (TCE) in public and private drinking water supplies in south Adams County, Colorado. South Adams County is located directly adjacent to and to the west and north of the Rocky Mountain Arsenal ("RMA"), a facility owned by the Army. TCE has also been found in monitoring wells located on the RMA facility.

On February 27, 1986, the Colorado Department of Health (CDH) issued a public health advisory on drinking water for residents of Adams County who live in an area north and west of the RMA to the South Platte River, based upon varying concentrations of organic chemical concentrations. The CDH health advisory advised residents in the areas served by private wells to boil their water before drinking or use bottled water as a temporary measure to minimize health risks. CDH also recommended that customers of the South Adams County Water and Sanitation District follow these recommendations until a treatment system for the public drinking water supply system is completed.

EPA currently is performing a remedial investigation/feasibility study in south Adams County in a manner not inconsistent with the National Contingency Plan (NCP), 40 C.F.R. Part 300 et. seq., to determine inter alia, the nature and extent of contamination, and to identify potential sources of contamination. EPA is also conducting preliminary assessment and site investigation work in south Adams County pursuant to the requirements of the NCP. For several years the Army has been studying the impact of contamination migrating from the RMA facility north of 80th Avenue. This amendment does not change this effort.

To date, data indicates that the RMA facility is one of two or more sources of or potential sources of TCE contamination of drinking water supplies in south Adams County. EPA and the Army are diligently pursuing the investigations described in the preceding paragraph to determine whether and to what extent other sources are responsible for TCE contamination in south Adams County. There is evidence that the Army is not the sole source of TCE contamination in south Adams County.

Due to complications in the reauthorization of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA), funds available to the EPA to conduct response measures have been limited. Therefore, pursuant to the Agreement between United States Environmental Protection Agency and United States Department of the Army, signed on March 20, 1986, the Army agreed to extend financial assistance to assist EPA in performing its responsibilities. EPA shall reimburse the Army for all or a portion of the financial assistance provided under this Agreement if funds are appropriated to and available for implementation of the CERCLA program and if EPA determines that: 1) substantial evidence indicates that sources other than the Army are responsible for TCE contamination in south Adams County; and 2) liability may be approximately and reasonably apportioned to these other sources. Additionally, EPA shall reimburse the Army for any excess money provided under this Agreement which is not used in the selection, design, and implementation of appropriate response measures.

With respect to the area south of 80th Avenue in south Adams County, this amendment provides additional funds, not to exceed six million dollars, for construction of a water treatment facility for south Adams County. Such funds shall be exclusively from appropriations made to the Department of Defense for purposes of military construction for fiscal year 1987. These funds are in addition to those already transferred to the EPA under the Agreement. It is anticipated that funds transferred to the EPA under this authorization will be subject to the terms of the Agreement or a new agreement reached within seven days of enactment of this amendment. Funds need not be transferred once funds are available to the EPA pursuant to CERCLA.

It is the intent of the committee that this is a one time authorization based on the unique circumstances in south Adams County and the temporary non-availability of EPA funds. It is not intended as any precedent with regard to allocation of funds for response actions between the EPA and the Department of Defense or for funding response actions at other sites. Nothing in this amendment shall affect any liability of the Department of the Army or of any other potentially responsible person under CERCLA or under the Solid Waste Disposal Act.

With regard to contamination north of 80th Avenue, the legislation acknowledges the present activities of Army to study contamination in the area north and northwest of the RMA facility. Army response actions shall be funded exclusively from appropriations made to the Department of Defense for purposes of the department's Environmental Restoration Program. Again, nothing in this amendment shall affect the liability of the Department of the Army or of any other potentially responsible person under CERCLA or under the Solid Waste Disposal Act.

BROOKE ARMY MEDICAL CENTER

The committee repealed Section 104 of the Fiscal Year 1985 Military Construction Authorization Act (Public Law 98-40) which directed the Secretary of the Army to design a 450 bed hospital to replace the Brooke Army Medical Center (BAMC) at Fort Sam Houston, San Antonio, Texas.

The Secretary of Defense's Blue Ribbon Panel on Hospital Sizing, established to provide an independent review of the scope of military medical construction, raised a number of questions regarding the need to replace the BAMC with a major medical center. These concerns stemmed primarily from the existing capacity of other medical facilities in the San Antonio area, particularly the 1000 bed Wilford Hall Air Force Medical Center at Lackland Air Force Base.

In light of the panel's findings, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs examined the matter further and determined that the BAMC replacement facility should be sized at 150 beds. The committee believes that this is a prudent decision, noting that this reduced project scope will save at least $250 million, and permit earlier construction of a number of other military medical facilities to meet pressing needs in other areas of the nation.

It is the committee's understanding that the Department of Defense will be considering a plan later this year for the most appropriate location for the Institute of Surgical Research and its burn center which are currently located at Brooke Army Medical Center. In this regard, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs has indicated that the burn center can remain in San Antonio, if not at Fort Sam Houston, then at Wilford Hall.

KIRTLAND AIR FORCE BASE CLINIC

The committee has authorized $16 million for a new out-patient medical clinic at Kirtland Air Force Base in lieu of the $25.5 million requested for an addition/alteration project at the existing hospital. These savings are possible because of an Air Force agreement with the Veterans Administration to utilize a portion of the new Albuquerque VA medical center for in-patient care.

The committee is pleased to see this step toward implementing Public Law 97-174, which encouraged DOD and the VA to share medical facilities when it is cost-effective to do so. The committee also welcomes the use of one-step turn-key competitive selection procedures for procurement of this clinic. The Secretary of Defense's Blue Ribbon Panel on Hospital Sizing last year emphasized the need to shorten the period between the planning and construction of DOD medical facilities. We encourage the department to continue to use the turn-key procurement authority granted in Section 807 of the Fiscal Year 1986 Military Construction Authorization Act for medical facilities.

PENTAGON COMPLEX

The Department of Defense and the General Services Administration have been conducting master planning with the purpose of constructing a large administrative facility on the property known as the Pentagon Reservation which includes the real estate on which the Pentagon and the Navy Annex (Federal Building 2) are located. The fiscal year 1987 military construction request included $2.5 million for soils exploration in preparation for this construction. It is anticipated that the Department of Defense will be requesting from the committee authority to expend a substantial amount of funds for the design of such an administrative complex to consolidate Defense Department activities currently in the National Capital Region on the property contiguous to the Pentagon and Federal Building 2.

The committee recommends denial of the expenditure of either fiscal year 1987 or any other funds to design such a complex. In taking this action, the committee does not preclude other authorized initiatives impacting other sites which would more efficiently house Defense Department activities whose presence is essential in the National Capital Region.

TITLE V—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION INFRASTRUCTURE NATO AUTHORIZATION

The Secretary of Defense requested $247,000,000 under this title for the United States contribution to the NATO common-funded Infrastructure Program in fiscal year 1986. The committee is very supportive of the NATO Infrastructure program and believes that the majority of construction requirements for Europe should be funded by it. It is essential to the United States that NATO fund our high priority facility construction requirements in Europe to the maximum extent and that we continue to meet our obligations to pay our share of this vital program. The committee approved the full $247,000,000 requested.

TITLE VI - GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

[in thousands of dollars]

	Enacted fiscal year 1986	Requested fiscal year 1987	Committee approved
Army National Guard	149,101	121,100	121,100
Major Construction	(87,822)	(97,453)	(109,624)
Minor Construction	(48,917)	(4,647)	(4,647)
Planning and Design	(12,362)	(19,000)	(19,000)
General Reduction			(-12,171)
Army Reserve....................	70,700	86,700	86,700
Major Construction	(55,295)	(74,300)	(74,300)
Minor Construction	(5,800)	(1,100)	(1,100)
Planning and Design	(9,600)	(11,300)	(11,300)
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve .	51,800	44,500	44,500
Major Construction	(46,060)	(37,700)	(37,700)
Minor Construction	(1,540)	(1,500)	(1,500)
Planning and Design	(4,200)	(5,300)	(5,300)
Air National Guard	139,000	140,000	140,000
Major Construction	(121,400)	(122,450)	(127,775)
Minor Construction	(8,000)	(2,130)	(2,130)
Planning and Design	(9,600)	(15,420)	(15,420)
General Reduction			(-5,325)
Air Force Reserve	70,650	58,900	58,900
Major Construction	(62,250)	(49,760)	(49,760)
Minor Construction	(3,400)	(2,580)	(2,580)
Planning and Design	(5,000)	(6,560)	(6,560)
Total	481,251	451,200	451,200
Major Construction ..	(372,827)	(381,663)	(399,159)
Minor Construction ..	(67,657)	(11,957)	(11,957)
Planning and design .	(40,767)	(57,580)	(57,580)
General Reduction ...	—		(-17,496)

The authorization of appropriations requests for fiscal year 1987 total $451,200 including major construction, minor construction, and planning and design in support of facilities for the Guard and Reserve Forces. The committee recognizes the increasingly vital role of the Guard and Reserve Forces in improving the readiness capability of the total military force.

The following summary represents the status of lump sum authorization provided continuously since the Guard and Reserve Forces facilities program reverted to this method of authorization in 1963:

RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES - ESTIMATED STATUS OF LUMP SUM AUTHORIZATION[1]
AS OF JUNE 11, 1986
[in thousands of dollars]

	Army		Naval and Marine Corps	Air Force		Total
	National Guard	Reserve	Reserve	National Guard	Reserve	
Lump sum authorization (cumulative fiscal years 1963-86)	892,431	683,657	469,515	696,490	387,397	3,129,490
Estimate of authorization to be committed through fiscal year 1986	832,228	666,903	452,714	677,140	382,397	3,011,382
Uncommitted Balance	60,203	16,754	16,801	19,350	5,000	118,108
Added by present bill	121,100	86,700	44,500	140,000	58,900	451,200
Total available, fiscal year 1987	181,303	103,454	61,301	159,350	63,900	569,308
Estimated commitments in fiscal year 1987	121,100	86,100	44,500	140,000	58,900	450,600
Estimated residual authorization, end fiscal year 1987	60,203	17,354	16,801	19,350	5,000	118,708

1/ Figures include Planning and Design and minor construction for FY 1984-87 in accordance with P.L. 97-214.

SUMMARY OF GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES PROGRAM CHANGES

Total Guard and Reserve forces authorization request ...	$451,200
Army National Guard	121,100
Army Reserve	86,700
Navy and Marine Corps Reserve	44,500
Air National Guard	140,000
Air Force Reserve	58,900
Committee Additions:	
Army National Guard:	
Chandler, AZ: 60 Person Armory	810
Tucson, AZ: 400 Person Armory	1,576
Camp Shelby, MS: Rehab Phase 21A	4,451
Camp McCain, MS:	
Combined Support Maint Shop	1,745
Three-Unit Armory	1,410
Barracks, Admin and Mess Hall	625
Dyersburg, TN: 100 person Armory	984
Platteville, WI: Armory Renovation	570

Air National Guard:	
Martinsburg, WV: Phase I, Ramp Addition	2,500
Charleston, WV: Multiple Facilities Additions	625
Mitchell ANGB, WI: Composite Facility	2,200
Total Additions	17,496
Committee Reductions:	
Army National Guard	12,171
Air National Guard	5,325
Total Reductions:	17,496
New Guard and Reserve forces authorization	451,200
Army National Guard	121,100
Army Reserve	86,700
Navy and Marine Corps Reserve	44,500
Air National Guard	140,000
Air Force Reserve	58,900

NATIONAL GUARD CENTER

The committee understands that the National Guard Bureau has seven or eight leased locations throughout the National Capital Region. It is currently conducting a consolidation study which should be completed in the near future and which examines the feasibility of consolidating these activities in Northern Virginia at an estimated annual savings in excess of $2 million. In order to accomplish this consolidation, approximately $22 million in construction funding will be required.

In order that the project can be designed and thus considered for fiscal year 1988 construction funding, the committee directs that planning and design be initiated in fiscal year 1987.

TITLE VII —GENERAL PROVISIONS

ESTABLISHMENT OF CERTAIN AMOUNTS REQUIRED TO BE SPECIFIED BY LAW

The committee established certain thresholds for the forthcoming military construction program. The table below compares the amounts specified by law for fiscal year 1986 to those approved by the committee for fiscal year 1987:

		FY 1986	FY 1987
1.	Maximum amount for Minor Construction	$1,000,000	$2,000,000
2.	Amount for reporting A/E Contracts	$ 300,000	$ 300,000
3.	Maximum amount per unit for family housing improvement	$ 30,000	$ 30,000
4.	Maximum annual rental for family housing in the U.S., Puerto Rico or Guam	$ 10,000	$ 10,000
5.	A. Maximum annual rental for a family housing unit leased in a foreign country	$ 16,800	$ 16,800
	B. Maximum number of family housing units that may be leased in foreign countries at any one time	32,000	34,500
6.	Maximum rental per year for family housing facilities leased in a foreign country	$ 250,000	$ 250,000

CONSTRUCTION OF POSTAL FACILITIES

This section will allow the Postal Service to provide facilities on base to serve members of the Army and Air Force. Current law requires the Army and Air Force to provide for postal facilities. Congress has historically denied military construction funds for such projects because these facilities are the responsibility of the Postal Service. This change will remove this inconsistency between existing legislation and Congressional intent.

ESTABLISH "RENOVATION" AS A NEW CATEGORY OF WORK

This provision will allow funding of the combined maintenance, repair, and minor construction work required to renovate facilities. Currently, all three efforts have separate approval and funding rules which delay execution of concurrent work limitation for a minor construction project.

OVERSEAS HIGH COST FAMILY HOUSING LEASES

This section increases the number of high cost family housing leases by 20 and reflects the devaluation of the dollar against foreign currencies.

HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE FACILITIES

This section will lessen the amount of time needed to acquire Hazardous Waste Storage Facilities by providing a "class" authorization. Current procedures require line item approval by the Congress in the budget process. However, construction cannot begin until a storage permit has been issued.

PLANNING AND DESIGN

The committee authorized cross-year funding for planning, design, study, architect, and engineering services.

SALE AND REPLACEMENT OF REAL PROPERTY

This provision amends 10 USC 2667a by permitting the secretary of the military department concerned to acquire land and replacement facilities as consideration for the sale of property and facilities under his control.

DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AND MILITARY APPLICATIONS OF NUCLEAR ENERGY AUTHORIZATION

Division C provides authority for appropriations to the Secretary of Energy for the operating expenses, capital equipment, and construction costs related to the National Defense Programs of the Department of Energy.

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

S. 2218 was referred to the Strategic and Theater Nuclear Forces Subcommittee for recommendation to the full committee. The subcommittee held hearings on the bill on April 8, and received testimony from the Honorable Sylvester Foley, Assistant Secretary for Defense Programs; Brigadier General Sidney Davis, USA, Acting Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Atomic Energy; Military Liaison Committee to the Department of Energy members Major General Robert F. Molinelli, USA, Acting Chairman; Rear Admiral Robert Bacon, USN; and Brigadier General Charles May, USAF. Also testifying were: Roger E. Batzel, Director, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory; Siegfried S. Hecker, Director, Los Alamos National Laboratory; and Irwin Welber, President, Sandia National Laboratory.

In addition, the subcommittee received testimony from Secretary of Energy, John S. Herrington, Honorable Sylvester Foley, Honorable Mary Walker, Assistant Secretary for Environment, Health and Safety, Department of Energy; Mr. John Hunter, Director, Nuclear Energy and Surplus Facilities Management Division, Richland Operations Office and Mr. Roger D. Rollins, Chief, Reactors Branch, Savannah River Operations Office on May 21, 1986 on issues related to the safety of defense program nuclear reactors.

The full committee received testimony from Honorable Kenneth Adelman, Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Honorable Richard Perle, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Policy, Mr. Robert Barker, Deputy Assistant Director, Bureau of Verification and Intelligence, ACDA; and Dr. Hans Bethe, on April 29, on issues related to nuclear weapons testing. The hearing continued on April 30 with Dr. Alton Frye testifying.

OPERATING EXPENSES

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

Research, Development and Testing. This program provides for the effort performed by the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, the Los Alamos National Laboratory, the Sandia National Laboratories, the Nevada Operations Office, and other contractors in research, development and testing of nuclear weapons. The activities funded herein include the traditional support of nuclear warhead development and an increasing level of effort for nuclear-driven directed energy research. The latter is being pursued primarily to characterize the threat that space-based components of the Strategic Defensive Initiative may have to face.

Within this account, the administration requests $238.3 million for research and development associated with the SDI, and $226.7 million for SDI related testing. For budgetary considerations, the committee recommends that funding for SDI research and development be reduced by $74 million and that funding for SDI testing be reduced by $69 million.

As part of the initiative to enhance conventional defense capabilities, the committee included a legislative provision to provide $24 million to the Department of Energy national laboratories only for research on advanced conventional munitions and warhead concepts, and $10 million only to provide methodological support to the Office of Munitions in the Department of Defense.

The committee closely reviewed the weapons development activities contained in the fiscal year 1987 request. On the basis of this review, the committee recommends that development of nuclear warheads for the ASW Stand-off Weapon and the nuclear variant of the Standard Missile-2 (SM-2-N) be cancelled. Accordingly, the operating account is reduced by $4.6 million and $3.7 million respectively. $1.125 million is added to the Inertial Confinement Fusion program to restore the fiscal year 1986 level of funding for KMS Fusion, Inc.

The committee authorized the full amount requested for community assistance payments at Los Alamos, New Mexico for fiscal year 1987. Last year, the Congress authorized a one time payment to the Oak Ridge communities to buy out all remaining Federal obligations to those communities under the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955. The committee encourages the Department of Energy, consistent with budgetary constraints, to pursue a similar approach with Los Alamos County and to include the necessary funds in its fiscal year 1988 budget request.

MATERIALS PRODUCTION

Reactor Operations. In the aftermath of the Chernobyl nuclear reactor accident, public concern about the safety of reactors in the United States without containment facilities, which includes all Department of Energy defense program reactors, has heightened. Testimony before the committee made clear the different design features and very different operational factors, which virtually eliminate the chance of a similar accident at a Department of Energy facility. The committee is concerned, however, about the age of the Department of Energy reactors, and their continued ability to meet our long term defense needs. Accordingly, the committee included a legislative provision requesting a report to the Committees on Armed Services not later than December 1, 1986. This report shall address the comparative costs and safety factors involved in constructing containment facilities around existing DOE rectors versus proceeding with the construction of a new production reactor(s).

Enriched Material. Of the $204.5 million requested for separative work and other associated costs to provide enriched material for the Nuclear Materials Production and Naval Reactors programs, a total of $190 million is requested to supply uranium-235 to the naval reactors program. In view of budgetary constraints, the committee recommends a reduction in the request for naval reactor materials of $33 million. This would permit all naval reactor requirements to be satisfied, but would delay the achievement of the desired production rates at the two facilities dedicated to this process.

NAVAL REACTORS DEVELOPMENT

The $529.8 million requested for naval reactors development funds efforts to develop naval nuclear reactor plants and cores that will improve the performance and enhance safe operation of nuclear powered combatant vessels. Due to budgetary constraints, the committee recommends that an undistributed reduction of $20 million be applied to this function.

PLANT CONSTRUCTION

In past years, the committee has been very supportive of plant construction projects whose principal rationale was to bring defense programs activities in compliance with federal, state or local environmental requirements. The budget request for fiscal year 1987 continues funding for a number of environmental projects authorized in prior years, and initiates a number of new projects for this purpose.

The committee views with concern the total estimated cost of these projects in view of the severe budgetary constraints in fiscal year 1987, and the prospect of little or no real growth in defense programs over the next several years. Accordingly, the committee recommends reductions in plant construction projects totaling $81.7 million. Because there is a strong potential for facility or site shutdown if the Department of Energy does not carry through on its commitment to local, state or federal agencies, the committee recommends bill language that would provide legislative relief to the Department of Energy from adverse actions resulting from projects that were requested by the department and denied by the Congress.

In addition to reductions in certain environmental projects, the committee recommends cancellation of project 84-D-113 consistent with the cancellation of the nuclear warhead for the ASW Standoff Weapon. The committee also recommends that Project 87-D-122, which is related to the development of a SRAM II warhead, be deferred. This action is consistent with the committee's recommendation to slow the pace of the SRAM II missile development. Finally, for budgetary reasons, the committee recommends a reduction in Project 87-D-104. Together, these reductions amount to $54.3 million, for a total reduction in the plant construction accounts of $136.0 million.

CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

The administration requested $547.465 million for capital equipment related to Department of Energy defense activities, of which $322.8 is for weapons activities. Within the weapons activities account, $34.5 million was requested for capital equipment in support of SDI research and development and $21.5 million was requested for capital equipment in support of SDI testing. In view of budgetary constraints, the committee recommends that the capital equipment request for SDI related activities be reduced by $35 million.

UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION

The committee carefully weighed the relative priorities of the Department of Energy defense programs both in the context of the Department of Defense programs under the purview of the Strategic and Theater Nuclear Forces Subcommittee, and in the context of the total defense function (050). In view of the severity of the budget constraints, and the level of reduction being recommended for weapons programs in the strategic, tactical and naval forces mission areas, the committee recommends an overall reduction in the Department of Energy defense activities of $673.2 million. $373.2 million of this reduction is to be applied to the specific line items specified below. The remainder of the reduction, $300 million, is to be applied by the Department of Energy in a manner that provides a balance between research and development activities and the maintenance of a viable weapons production complex. Because of the importance that the committee attaches to verification and control technology programs, no portion of the undistributed reduction shall be applied against these accounts.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS COUNCIL

Section 1632 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1985 (Public Law 98-525) called for a blue ribbon task group to review aspects of the management and oversight of the nation's nuclear weapons programs. The group, chaired by William Clark, submitted its report in July 1985. That report contained numerous recommendations for actions by the Department of Defense, the Department of Energy, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Congress. Although the committee notes improvements in the presentation of nuclear weapons cost data, and an increased sensitivity to these costs in the intervening year, few of the recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Task Group have been implemented.

In an effort to speed the implementation process, the committee adopted an amendment that abolishes the Military Liaison Committee (a DOD-only advisory group) and replaces it with an interdepartmental Nuclear Weapons Council, chaired by the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, to ensure high-level DOD scrutiny of the capabilities and costs of proposed new nuclear weapons developments, and to ensure that appropriate tradeoffs are considered. Other members shall be the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who will ensure that the real requirements for nuclear weapons capabilities established by our field commanders are accurately reflected in the proposed specifications for new nuclear weapons, rather than reflecting the views of a service headquarters, and the Assistant Secretary for Defense Programs of the Department of Energy who will ensure that the views of the DOE weapons laboratories and the DOE field organizations supporting the production complex regarding cost, performance, safety, security and other issues are brought before the council.

The Nuclear Weapons Council is directed to report to the Congress by 1 March 1987 on other aspects of the Blue Ribbon Task Group's recommendations prior to the fiscal year 1988 defense authorization markup.

AUTHORIZATION RECOMMENDED

The authorizations recommended for fiscal year 1987 are shown in the table below:

SUMMARY OF CHANGES -- FISCAL YEAR 1987 DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY PROGRAMS

(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1987 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
Section 101 - Operating Expenses			
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES			
Research and Development	1,067,200	-81,300	985,900
Testing	633,800	-69,000	564,800
Inertial Confinement Fusion	22,500	1,125	23,625
Production and Surveillance	1,968,504		1,968,504
Program Direction			
Weapons Programs	52,450		52,450
Community Assistance	8,100		8,100
Total, Weapons Activities	3,752,554	-149,175	3,603,379
MATERIALS PRODUCTION			
Reactor Operations	616,660		616,660
Processing of Nuclear Materials	499,830		499,830
Special Isotope Separation			
Supporting Services	252,500		252,500
Plasma Separation Process			
Enriched Material	204,500	-33,000	171,500
Program Direction	22,900		22,900
Total, Materials Production	1,596,390	-33,000	1,563,390
DEFENSE WASTE AND BYPRODUCT MANAGEMENT			
Interim Waste Management	324,730	0	324,730
Long-term Waste Management Technology	88,820		88,820
Terminal Storage	39,100		39,100
Program Direction	2,400		2,400
Total, Defense Nuclear Waste	455,050	0	455,050

(Dollars in thousands)

PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1987 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
VERIFICATION AND CONTROL TECHNOLOGY			
Verification and Control Technology	95,500	0	95,500
Program Direction	0		0
Total, Verification & Control Tech	95,500	0	95,500
NUCLEAR SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY			
Nuclear Safeguards and Security	61,100	0	61,100
Program Direction			
Total, Nuclear Materials Security and Safeguards Development	61,100	0	61,100
SECURITY INVESTIGATIONS	33,300	0	33,300
NAVAL REACTORS DEVELOPMENT			
Plant Development	71,000		71,000
Reactor Development	274,000		274,000
Reactor Operation and Evaluation	173,000		173,000
Program Direction	11,800		11,800
Undistributed Reduction		-20,000	-20,000
Total, Naval Reactors Development	529,800	-20,000	509,800
ADJUSTMENTS	0	0	0
TOTAL, DOE DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	6,523,694	-202,175	6,321,519

PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1987 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
	(Dollars in thousands)		
Section 102 - Plant and Capital Equipment			
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES			
87-D-101, General plant projects, various locations	29,000		29,000
87-D-102, Environmental compliance and cleanup LLNL, Livermore, CA	7,000	-7,000	0
87-D-104, Safeguards and security enhancement, phase II. LLNL, Livermore CA	4,300	-2,300	2,000
87-D-121, General plant projects, various locations	32,000		32,000
87-D-122, SRAM II warhead production facilities, various locations	5,000	-5,000	0
87-D-123, Protective clothing decon facility, Rocky Flats, Golden, CO	500		500
87-D-127, ES&H Upgrade, Mound Facility, Miamisburg, OH	2,400	-2,400	0
87-D-130, Receiving and shipping facility, Pinellas Plant, St. Petersburg, FL	300		300
86-D-101, General plant projects, various locations	0		0
86-D-121, General plant projects, various locations	0		0
86-D-103, Decontamination and waste treatment facility, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA	5,300	-5,300	0
86-D-104, Strategic defenses facility, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, New Mexico	13,000		13,000
86-D-105, Instrumentation systems laboratory, Sandia National Laboratories Albuquerque, New Mexico	5,800		5,800
86-D-122, Structural upgrade of existing plutonium facilities, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, Colorado	2,420	-2,420	0

(Dollars in thousands)

PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1987 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
86-D-123, Environmental hazards elimination, various locations	16,840	-16,840	0
86-D-124, Safeguards and site security upgrading, Phase II, Mound Plant, Miamisburg, Ohio	1,880		1,880
86-D-125, Safeguards and site security upgrading, Phase II, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, Texas	8,410		8,410
86-D-130, Tritium loading facility replacement, Savannah River Plant, Aiken, South Carolina	29,700		29,700
86-D-106, Data Communications Center Los Alamos National Laboratory, New Mexico	12,000		12,000
85-D-102, Nuclear weapons research, development, and testing facilities revitalization, Phase I, various locations	29,950		29,950
85-D-103, Safeguards and security enhancements, Lawrence Livermore and Sandia National Labs, Livermore CA	6,500		6,500
85-D-105, Combined device assembly facility, Nevada Test Site, Nevada	9,400		9,400
85-D-106, Hardened engineering test Building, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California	330		330
85-D-112, Enriched uranium recovery improvements, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, Tennessee	19,000		19,000
85-D-113, Power plant and steam distribution system, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, Texas	1,790		1,790
85-D-115, Renovate plutonium building utility systems, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, Colorado	13,440		13,440

(Dollars in thousands)

PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1987 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
85-D-121, Air and water pollution control facilities, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, Tennessee	9,160	-9,160	0
85-D-123, Safeguards and site security upgrade, Phase I, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, Texas	0		0
85-D-124, Safeguards and site security upgrade, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, CO	0		0
85-D-125, Tactical bomb production facilities, various locations	12,800		12,800
84-D-102, Radiation-hardened integrated circuit laboratory, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM	3,000		3,000
84-D-104, Nuclear materials storage facility, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico	0		0
84-D-105, Safeguards and Security upgrades, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico			
84-D-106, Security System Upgrade Sandia National Laboratory, New Mexico	0		0
84-D-107, Nuclear testing facilities revitalization, various locations	13,300		13,300
84-D-112, Trident II warhead production facilities, various locations	14,500		14,500
84-D-113, Antisubmarine warfare/standoff weapon warhead production facilities, various locations	42,000	-47,000	-5,000
84-D-115, Electrical system expansion, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, Texas	0		0
84-D-117, Inert assembly and test facility, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, Texas	0		0

PROGRAM	(Dollars in thousands) FISCAL YEAR 1987 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
84-D-118, High explosive subassembly facility, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, Texas	0		0
84-D-120, Explosive component test facility, Mound Facility, Miamisburg, OH	0		0
84-D-124, Environmental Improvements Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, Tennessee	9,280	-9,280	0
84-D-211, Safeguards and site security upgrading, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	27,220		27,220
84-D-212, Safeguards and site security upgrade, Pinellas Plant, Florida	0		0
83-D-199, Buffer land acquisition, Lawrence Livermore and Sandia National Laboratories, Livermore, CA	0		0
82-D-107, Utilities and equipment restoration, replacement, and upgrade, Phase III, various locations	97,904		97,904
82-D-111, Interactive graphics systems various locations	0		0
82-D-144, Simulation technology laboratory, Sandia National Laboratory Albuquerque, New Mexico	6,000		6,000
79-7-0, Universal pilot plant, Pantex Plant, Amerillo, Texas	0		0
Total, Weapons Activities	491,424	-106,700	384,724

PROGRAM	(Dollars in thousands) FISCAL YEAR 1987 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
MATERIALS PRODUCTION			
87-D-156, Reactor Effluent Cooling Water Thermal Mitigation, Savannah River, South Carolina	5,000	-5,000	0
87-D-146, General Plant Projects, various locations	35,980		35,980
87-D-149, Reduced chemical discharges to process sewers, Richland, WA	3,150		3,150
87-D-150, Radioactive liquid effluent treatment facility, partial design only, Richland, WA	4,000	-4,000	0
87-D-152, Environmental protection plantwide, Savannah River, SC	1,500	-1,500	0
87-D-159, FMPC EH&S Improvements Fernald, OH	10,000		10,000
86-D-146, General chemical discharges various locations	0	3,150	-3,150
86-D-149, Productivity retention program, Phases I & II, various locations	71,625		71,625
86-D-150, In-core neutron monitoring system, N reactor, Richland, Washington	2,760		2,760
86-D-151, PUREX, electrical system upgrade, Richland, Washington	3,780		3,780
86-D-152 Reactor electrical distribution system, Savannah River, SC	8,410		8,410
86-D-153, Additional line III furnace, Savannah River, South Carolina	7,605		7,605
86-D-154, Effluent treatment facility Savannah River, South Carolina	15,650	-15,650	0
86-D-156, Plantwide safeguards systems, Savannah River, South Carolina	13,610		13,610

PROGRAM	(Dollars in thousands) FISCAL YEAR 1987 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
86-D-157, Hydroflourination system - FB-line, Savannah River, South Carolina	2,310		2,310
85-D-137, Vault safety special nuclear material inventory system, Richland, WA	0		0
85-D-139, Fuel processing restoration Idaho Fuels Processing Facility, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho	36,530		36,530
85-D-140, Productivity and radiological improvements, Feed Materials Production Center, Fernald, Ohio	23,500		23,500
85-D-145, Fuel production facility, Savannah River, SC	33,500		33,500
84-D-134, Safeguards and Security Improvements, Savannah River, SC	7,515		7,515
84-D-135, Process facility modifications Richland, WA	34,475		34,475
84-D-136, Enriched uranium conversion facility modifications, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, Tennessee	1,000		1,000
84-D-137, Facility Security Systems Upgrades, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho	0		0
83-D-148, Non-radioactive hazardous waste management, Savannah River, SC	0		0
82-D-124, Restoration of production capabilities, Phases II, III, IV and V, various locations	3,511		3,511
82-D-201, Special plutonium recovery facilities, JB-line, Savannah River, SC	0		0
Total Materials Production	325,411	-29,300	296,111

PROGRAM	(Dollars in thousands) FISCAL YEAR 1987 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
DEFENSE WASTE AND BYPRODUCTS MANAGEMENT			
87-D-171, General plant projects various locations	26,535	0	26,535
87-D-172, WESF K-3 Filter upgrade Richland, WA	500		500
87-D-173, 242-A Evaporater/crystallizer upgrade, Richland, WA	2,800		2,800
87-D-174, 241-AQ Tank farm, Richland, WA	2,100		2,100
87-D-175, Steam System Rehab, Phase I, RI	900		900
87-D-177, TRA Liquid radioactive waste cleanup, Phase III, (INEL), ID	700		700
87-D-180, Burial ground expansion, Savannah River, SC	6,300		6,300
87-D-181, Diversion box and pump pit containment building, Savannah River SC	1,360		1,360
86-D-171, General plant projects, interim waste operations and long-term waste management technology, various locations	0		0
86-D-172, B plant F-filter, Richland, WA	2,949		2,949
86-D-173, Central waste disposal facility, Oak Ridge, Tennesse	0		0
86-D-174, Low-level waste processing and shipping system, Feed Materials Production Center, Fernald, Ohio	9,872		9,872
86-D-175, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory security upgrade (INEL), ID	7,250		7,250
85-D-157, Seventh calcined solids storage facility, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho	0		0
85-D-158, Central warehouse upgrade, Richland, Washington	1,044		1,044

(Dollars in thousands)

PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1987 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
85-D-159, New waste transfer facilities H-area, Savannah River, South Carolina	7,318		7,318
85-D-160, Test reactor area security system upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory (INEL), Idaho	2,703		2,703
82-N-103, Waste Handling & Isolation Facilities, Richland, VA	0		0
81-T-105, Defense waste processing facility, Savannah River, S.C.	123,967		123,967
Total, Defense Waste & Byproducts Mgmt.	196,306	0	196,306
VERIFICATION AND CONTROL TECHNOLOGY			
85-D-171, Space science laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico	2,000	0	2,000
NUCLEAR SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY			
86-D-186, Nuclear safeguards technology laboratory, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico	0	0	0
Total, Nuclear Safeguards and Security	0	0	0
NAVAL REACTORS DEVELOPMENT			
87-N-101, General plant projects, various locations	4,800	0	4,800
87-N-102, Kesselring site facilities upgrade, KAPL, West Milton, NY	5,000		5,000
87-N-103, Computation laboratory addition Bettis Atomic Power Lab, West Mifflin, PA	2,300		2,300
86-N-101, General plant projects, various locations.	0		0
86-N-104, Reactor modifications, advance test reactor, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory	0		0

(Dollars in thousands)

PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1987 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
82-N-111, Materials facility, Savannah River, South Carolina	0		0
81-T-112, Modifications and additions to prototype facilities, various locations	0		0
Total, Naval Reactors Development	12,100	0	12,100
TOTAL, DOE DEFENSE ACTIVITIES PLANT CONSTRUCTION	1,027,241	-136,000	891,241
CAPITAL EQUIPMENT			
Weapons Activities	322,870	-35,000	287,870
Inertial Confinement Fusion			
Materials production	126,090		126,090
Defense Waste & Byproducts Management	37,805		37,805
Verification and Control Technology	4,200		4,200
Nuclear Safeguards and Security	4,800		4,800
Naval Reactors Development	51,700		51,700
TOTAL, DOE DEFENSE ACTIVITIES CAPITAL EQUIPMENT	547,465	-35,000	512,465
Subtotal, Operating Expenses	6,523,694	-202,175	6,321,519
Subtotal, Plant Construction	1,027,241	-136,000	891,241
Subtotal, Capital Equipment	547,465	-35,000	512,465
DOE Defense Activities-Undist. Reduc.		-300,000	-300,000
TOTAL, DOE DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	8,098,400	-673,175	7,425,225

DIVISION D—CIVIL DEFENSE

The administration requested $126.56 million for the nation's civil defense preparedness program in fiscal year 1987, a decrease of three percent from the funding level approved by the Congress for fiscal year 1986.

The fiscal year 1987 request represents a sustaining level that will preserve the base needed for whatever program the administration concludes should be recommended for fiscal years 1988 and beyond. That future program will be formulated upon completion of a study, which was requested by the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate in the fiscal year 1986 Defense Authorization Act. The committee regrets that this study was not available in time to guide the formulation of the fiscal year 1987 funding request, or the committee's recommendation with regard to such funding.

Due to budgetary considerations, the committee recommends a reduction of $15.0 million in the amount requested for the civil defense program administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency. The committee directs that the allocation of this reduction not adversely affect those planned activities that are directly related to wartime contingencies in contrast to activities related to natural and other disasters.

FISCAL YEAR 1987 CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRAM
(B/A in Millions of Dollars)

	FY 86 CURRENT	FY 87 REQUEST
EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PLANNING & ASSISTANCE		
State and Local Emergency Management	55.267	54.835
Radiological Defense	9.299	9.225
Population Protection	11.484	11.393
State and Local Direction, Control, and Warning	.539	.535
Research	.096	.100
Training and Education	10.947	9.134
Telecommunications and Warning	16.677	13.697
SALARIES AND EXPENSES	26.506	27.646
TOTAL	130.815	126.565

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS

General Counsel of the Department of Defense,
Washington, DC, March 7, 1986.

Hon. George Bush,
President of the Senate,
Washington, DC.

Dear Mr. President: There is forwarded herewith legislation, "To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1987 for the Armed Forces for procurement, for research, development, test, and evaluation, for operation and maintenance, and for working capital funds, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes."

In accordance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, and section 1405 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986, we are also submitting herewith, as separate legislation, a similar request for authorization of appropriations for fiscal years 1988 and 1989.

These proposals are part of the Department of Defense legislative program for the 99th Congress and the Office of Management and Budget advises that enactment of these proposals would be in accord with the program of the President.

Title I provides procurement authorization for the Military Departments and for the Defense Agencies in amounts equal to the budget authority included in the President's budget for fiscal year 1987. It contains a provision that extends for fiscal year 1987 the authority to waive certain costs in connection with the NATO AWACS program.

Title II provides for the authorization of each of the research, development, test, and evaluation appropriations for the Military Departments and the Defense Agencies in amounts equal to the budget authority included in the President's budget for fiscal year 1987. The authorization includes a provision that authorizes the appropriation of funds to cover unbudgeted increases as a result of pay increases for civilian personnel paid from the research, development, test, and evaluation appropriations. It also provides for the authorization of appropriations for the purchase of foreign currencies from the Treasury Department for Department of Defense programs.

Title III provides for authorization of the operation and maintenance appropriations of the Military Departments and the Defense Agencies in amounts equal to the budget authority included in the President's budget for fiscal year 1987. The authorization includes a provision that authorizes the appropriation of funds that are necessary to cover unbudgeted increases in fuel costs, unbudgeted civilian pay increases, and unbudgeted inflation in the cost of activities covered by Title III. Title III also includes the authorization of appropriations for the purpose of providing capital for working-capital funds of the Military Departments and the Defense Agencies in amounts equal to the budget authority included in the President's budget for fiscal year 1987. It also contains a provision authorizing the appropriation of funds for providing assistance to the 10th International Pan American Games in accordance with section 304 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986.

Title IV prescribes the end strengths for active duty personnel in each component of the Armed Forces as required by section 138(c)(1) of title 10, United States Code, in the numbers provided for by the budget authority and appropriations requested for these components for fiscal year 1987.

Title V provides for end strengths of the Selected Reserve of each reserve component of the Armed Forces in the numbers provided for by the budget authority and appropriations requested for the Department of Defense in the President's budget for fiscal year 1987. Title V also prescribes the end strengths for reserve component members on full-time active duty or full-time National Guard duty for the purpose of administering the reserve forces and provides for an increase in the number of certain enlisted and commissioned personnel who may be serving on active duty in support of the reserve components. Finally, Title V amends section 138(b)(1) of title 10, United States Code, by deleting the reference to authorization of the average strength of the Selected Reserve in accordance with the Department's request for authorization of Selected Reserve strength on the basis of an end strength.

Title VI provides that the provisions of section 138(c)(2) of title 10, United States Code, pertaining to the authorization of a civilian personnel end strength for the Department of Defense shall not be applicable with respect to fiscal year 1987.

Title VII provides for the average military training student loads as required by section 138(d)(1) of title 10, United States Code, in the numbers provided for this purpose in the President's budget for fiscal year 1987.

Title VIII consists of three general provisions. Section 801 increases the size of the Special Defense Acquisition Fund by $100,000,000. Section 802 amends the provisions of section 1079(a)(7) of title 10, United States Code, which codified the recurring annual provision formerly in the Appropriation Act pertaining to medical care under the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS). The amendment, which would become effective as of October 1, 1985, deletes the provision relating to reimbursements when a person was covered by an insurance plan that provided at least 75 percent coverage for the care received and substitutes a provision referring to an insurance plan providing primary coverage for the person's medical care. This will make the codified provision identical to the recurring provision which was amended in the Appropriation Act subsequent to the codification of section 1079(a)(7). Section 803 repeals section 2208(j) of title 10, United States Code, relating to the Industrial Fund Asset Capitalization Program.

Sincerely,

H. LAWRENCE GARRETT, III.

Enclosures.

A BILL To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1987 for the Armed Forces for procurement, for research, development, test, and evaluation, for operation and maintenance, and for working capital funds, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1987".

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, ARMY

SEC. 101. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1987 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, weapons, and tracked combat vehicles, and ammunition and for other procurement for the Army as follows:

For aircraft, $3,264,700,000.
For missiles, $2,438,200,000.
For weapons and tracked combat vehicles, $4,452,600,000.
For ammunition, $2,254,000,000.
For other procurement, $6,169,000,000.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

SEC. 102. (a) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1987 for procurement of aircraft, weapons (including missiles and torpedoes), shipbuilding and conversion, and other procurement for the Navy as follows:

For aircraft, $11,304,300,000.
For weapons (including missiles and torpedoes), $6,095,400,000.
For shipbuilding and conversion, $11,046,200,000.
For other procurement, $6,538,800,000.

(b) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1987 for procurement for the Marine Corps (including missiles, tracked combat vehicles, and other weapons) in the amount of $1,565,000,000.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, AIR FORCE

SEC. 103. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1987 for procurement of aircraft and missiles and for other procurement for the Air Force as follows:

For aircraft, $19,127,400,000.
For missiles, $8,982,400,000.
For other procurement, $10,900,300,000.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, DEFENSE AGENCIES

SEC. 104. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1987 for the Defense Agencies in the amount of $1,488,400,000.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, FOR CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION

SEC. 105. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1987 for the purposes of the destruction of lethal chemical weapons in accordance with section 1412 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986, in the amount of $120,100,000.

CERTAIN AUTHORITY PROVIDED THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE IN CONNECTION WITH THE NATO AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS) PROGRAM

SEC. 106. Effective on October 1, 1986, section 103(a) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1982 (Public Law 97-86; 95 Stat. 1100) is amended by striking out "fiscal year 1986" both places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "fiscal year 1987".

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 201. (a) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1987 for the use of the Armed Forces for research, development, test, and evaluation, in amounts as follows:

For the Army, $5,550,300,000.

For the Navy (including the Marine Corps), $10,586,800,000.

For the Air Force, $17,275,400,000.

For the Defense Agencies, $8,517,400,000, of which $141,800,000 is authorized for the activities of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, Test and Evaluation and of which $11,300,000 is authorized for the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1987, in addition to the amounts authorized to be appropriated in subsection (a) such amounts as may be necessary for unbudgeted amounts for salary, pay, retirement, and other employee benefits authorized by law for civilian employees of the Department of Defense whose compensation is provided by funds authorized to be appropriated in subsection (a).

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FOREIGN CURRENCY PURCHASES

SEC. 202. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1987 in the amount of $3,500,000 for the purchase of foreign currencies from the Treasury Department to pay expenses incurred in carrying out programs of the Department of Defense.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 301. (a) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1987 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for operation and maintenance, in amounts as follows:

For the Army, $21,341,870,000.
For the Navy, $25,688,500,000.
For the Marine Corps, $1,864,100,000.
For the Air Force, $21,214,500,000.
For the Defense Agencies, $8,573,700,000.
For the Army Reserve, $793,100,000.
For the Naval Reserve, $975,900,000.
For the Marine Corps Reserve, $65,300,000.
For the Air Force Reserve, $975,600,000.
For the Army National Guard, $1,786,900,000.
For the Air National Guard, $1,932,700,000.
For the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, $930,000.
For Defense Claims, $155,600,000.
For the Court of Military Appeals, $3,400,000.
For Environmental Restoration, Defense, $385,900,000.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1987, in addition to the amounts authorized to be appropriated in subsection (a), such sums as may be necessary—

(1) for unbudgeted increases in fuel costs;

(2) for unbudgeted increases as the result of inflation in the cost of activities authorized by subsection (a); and

(3) for unbudgeted amounts for salary, pay, retirement, and other employee benefits authorized by law for civilian employees of the Department of Defense whose compensation is provided for by funds authorized to be appropriated in subsection (a).

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

SEC. 302. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1987 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for providing capital for working-capital funds, in amounts as follows:

For the Army Stock Fund, $296,700,000.
For the Navy Stock Fund, $478,500,000.
For the Marine Corps Stock Fund, $45,900,000.
For the Air Force Stock Fund, $239,400,000.
For the Defense Stock Fund, $136,800,000.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR TENTH INTERNATIONAL PAN AMERICAN GAMES

SEC. 303. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1987 for assistance to the Tenth International Pan American Games in accordance with section 304 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986, in the amount of $15,000,000.

TITLE IV—ACTIVE FORCES

SEC. 401. The Armed Forces are authorized strengths for active duty personnel as of September 30, 1987, as follows:

(1) The Army, 780,900.
(2) The Navy, 592,700.

(3) The Marine Corps, 200,300.
(4) The Air Force, 607,200.

TITLE V—RESERVE FORCES

AUTHORIZATION OF END STRENGTHS FOR SELECTED RESERVE

SEC. 501. (a) For fiscal year 1987 the Selected Reserve of the reserve components of the Armed Forces shall be programmed to attain end strengths of not less than the following:

(1) The Army National Guard of the United States, 462,800.
(2) The Army Reserve, 327,600.
(3) The Naval Reserve, 155,700.
(4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 44,400.
(5) The Air National Guard of the United States, 115,200.
(6) The Air Force Reserve, 80,500.
(7) The Coast Guard Reserve, 13,000.

(b) The end strengths prescribed by subsection (a) for the Selected Reserve of any reserve component shall be proportionately reduced by (1) the total authorized strength of units organized to serve as units of the Selected Reserve of such component which are on active duty (other than for training) at the end of the fiscal year, and (2) the total number of individual members not in units organized to serve as units of the Selected Reserve of such component who are on active duty (other than for training or for unsatisfactory participation in training) without their consent at the end of the fiscal year.

AUTHORIZATION OF END STRENGTHS FOR RESERVES ON ACTIVE DUTY IN SUPPORT OF THE RESERVES

SEC. 502. (a) Within the end strengths prescribed in section 501, the reserve components of the Armed Forces are authorized, as of September 30, 1987, the following number of Reserves to be serving on full-time active duty or full-time duty, in the case of members of the National Guard, for the purpose of organizing, administering, recruiting, instructing, or training the reserve components:

(1) The Army National Guard of the United States, 28,721.
(2) The Army Reserve, 13,657.
(3) The Naval Reserve, 23,197.
(4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 1,782.
(5) The Air National Guard of the United States, 8,356.
(6) The Air Force Reserve, 676.

(b) Upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is in the national interest, the end strengths prescribed by subsection (a) may be increased by a total of not more than the number equal to 2 percent of the total end strengths prescribed.

(c) Upon the exercise of the authority provided by sections 673 or 673b of title 10, United States Code, Reserves covered by this section may perform duty in connection with sections 673 or 673b and shall not be counted against the number of Reserves ordered to active duty under those sections. Appropriations available for the pay of Reserves covered by this section prior to the exercise of the authority provided by sections 673 or 673b shall continue to be available for the pay of Reserves covered by this section.

SEC. 503. The first sentence of section 138(b)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "average".

INCREASE IN NUMBER OF CERTAIN PERSONNEL AUTHORIZED TO BE ON ACTIVE DUTY IN SUPPORT OF THE RESERVE COMPONENTS

SEC. 502. (a) The table in section 517(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to appear as follows:

"Grade	Army	Navy	Air Force	Marine Corps
E-9	554	165	140	13
E-8	2,199	381	438	74".

(b) The table in section 524(a) of such title is amended to appear as follows:

"Grade	Army	Navy	Air Force	Marine Corps
Major or Lieutenant Commander	3,340	900	584	115
Lieutenant Colonel or Commander	1,681	520	415	75
Colonel or Navy Captain	439	188	207	25".

(c) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect on October 1, 1986.

TITLE VI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

AUTHORIZATION OF END STRENGTH

SEC. 601. The provisions of section 138(c)(2) of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply with respect to fiscal year 1987 or with respect to the appropriation of funds for that year.

TITLE VII—MILITARY TRAINING STUDENT LOADS

AUTHORIZATION OF TRAINING STUDENT LOADS

SEC. 701. (a) For fiscal year 1987, the components of the Armed Forces are authorized average military training student loads as follows:

(1) The Army, 76,758.
(2) The Navy, 72,483.
(3) The Marine Corps, 19,433.
(4) The Air Force, 43,911.
(5) The Army National Guard of the United States, 18,262.
(6) The Army Reserve, 15,858.
(7) The Naval Reserve, 3,493.
(8) The Marine Corps Reserve, 3,944.
(9) The Air National Guard of the United States, 3,566.
(10) The Air Force Reserve, 2,127.

(b) The average military student loads for the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force and the reserve components authorized in subsection (a) for fiscal year 1987 shall be adjusted consistent with the manpower strengths authorized in titles IV and

V of this Act. Such adjustment shall be apportioned among the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force and the reserve components in such manner as the Secretary of Defense shall prescribe.

TITLE VIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SPECIAL DEFENSE ACQUISITION FUND

SEC. 801. Section 138(g) of title 10, United States Code is amended by striking out "$1,000,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "1,100,000,000".

REIMBURSEMENTS UNDER THE CIVILIAN HEALTH AND MEDICAL PROGRAM OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

SEC. 802. (a) Section 1079(a)(7) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "pays for at least 75 percent of" and inserting in lieu thereof "provides primary coverage for".

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall be effective as of October 1, 1985.

INDUSTRIAL FUND CAPITALIZATION PROGRAM

SEC. 803. Section 2208(j) of title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

A BILL To authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1988 and 1989 for the Armed Forces for procurement, for research, development, test, and evaluation, for operation and maintenance, and for working capital funds, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal years for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1988/1989".

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, ARMY

SEC. 101. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years 1988 and 1989 in such amounts as may be necessary for procurement of aircraft, missiles, weapons, and tracked combat vehicles, and ammunition and for other procurement for the Army.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

SEC. 102. (a) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years 1988 and 1989 in such amounts as may be necessary for procurement of aircraft, weapons (including missiles and torpedoes), shipbuilding and conversion, and other procurement for the Navy.

(b) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years 1988 and 1989 in such amounts as may be necessary for procurement for the Marine Corps (including missiles, tracked combat vehicles, and other weapons).

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, AIR FORCE

SEC. 103. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years 1988 and 1989 in such amounts as may be necessary for procurement of aircraft and missiles and for other procurement for the Air Force.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, DEFENSE AGENCIES

SEC. 104. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years 1988 and 1989 for the Defense Agencies in such amounts as may be necessary.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION

SEC. 105. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years 1988 and 1989 in such amounts as may be necessary for the purposes of the destruction of lethal chemical weapons in accordance with the provisions of section 1412 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986.

CERTAIN AUTHORITY PROVIDED THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE IN CONNECTION WITH THE NATO AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS) PROGRAM

SEC. 106. Effective on October 1, 1987, section 103(a) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1982 (Public Law 97-86; 95 Stat. 1100) is amended by striking out "fiscal year 1987" both places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "fiscal years 1988 and 1989".

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 201. (a) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years 1988 and 1989 in such amounts as may be necessary for the use of the Armed Forces for research, development, test, and evaluation.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years 1988 and 1989, in addition to the amounts authorized to be appropriated in subsection (a) such amounts as may be necessary for unbudgeted amounts for salary, pay, retirement, and other employee benefits authorized by law for civilian employees of the Department of Defense whose compensation is provided by funds authorized to be appropriated in subsection (a).

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FOREIGN CURRENCY PURCHASES

SEC. 202. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years 1988 and 1989 in such sums as may be necessary for the purchase of foreign currencies from the Treasury Department to pay expenses incurred in carrying out programs of the Department of Defense.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Sec. 301. (a) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years 1988 and 1989 in such amounts as may be necessary for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for operation and maintenance.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years 1988 and 1989, in addition to the amounts authorized to be appropriated in subsection (a), such sums as may be necessary—

(1) for unbudgeted increases in fuel costs;

(2) for unbudgeted increases as the result of inflation in the cost of activities authorized by subsection (a); and

(3) for unbudgeted amounts for salary, pay, retirement, and other employee benefits authorized by law for civilian employees whose compensation is provided for by funds authorized to be appropriated in subsection (a).

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

Sec. 302. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years 1988 and 1989 in such amounts as may be necessary for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for providing capital for working-capital funds.

TITLE IV—ACTIVE FORCES

Sec. 401. The Armed Forces are authorized strengths for active duty personnel as of September 30, 1988, for fiscal year 1988, and as of September 30, 1989, for fiscal year 1989, in such numbers as may be necessary.

TITLE V—RESERVE FORCES

AUTHORIZATION OF END STRENGTHS FOR SELECTED RESERVE

Sec. 501. (a) For the fiscal years 1988 and 1989 the Selected Reserve of the reserve components of the Armed Forces shall be programmed to attain such end strengths as may be necessary.

(b) The end strengths prescribed by subsection (a) for the Selected Reserve of any reserve component shall be proportionately reduced by (1) the total authorized strength of units organized to serve as units of the Selected Reserve of such component which are on active duty (other than for training) at the end of the fiscal year, and (2) the total number of individual members not in units organized to serve as units of the Selected Reserve of such component who are on active duty (other than for training or for unsatisfactory participation in training) without their consent at the end of the fiscal year.

AUTHORIZATION OF END STRENGTHS FOR RESERVES ON ACTIVE DUTY IN SUPPORT OF THE RESERVES

Sec. 502. (a) Within the end strengths prescribed in section 501, the reserve components of the Armed Forces are authorized, as of September 30, 1988, for fiscal year 1988, and as of September 30, 1989, for fiscal year 1989, such numbers of Reserves to be serving on full-time active duty or full-time duty, in the case of members of the National Guard, for the purpose of organizing, administering, recruiting, instructing, or training the reserve components as may be necessary.

(b) Upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is in the national interest, the end strengths prescribed by subsection (a) may be increased by a total of not more than the number equal to 2 percent of the total end strengths prescribed.

(c) Upon the exercise of the authority provided by sections 673 or 673b of title 10, United States Code, Reserves covered by this section may perform duty in connection with sections 673 or 673b and shall not be counted against the number of Reserves ordered to active duty under those sections. Appropriations available for the pay of Reserves covered by this section prior to the exercise of authority provided by sections 673 or 673b shall continue to be available for the pay of Reserves covered by this section.

TITLE VI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

AUTHORIZATION OF END STRENGTH

SEC. 601. The provisions of section 138(c)(2) of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply with respect to the fiscal years 1988 and 1989 or with respect to the appropriation of funds for that year.

TITLE VII—STUDENT TRAINING LOADS

AUTHORIZATION OF TRAINING STUDENT LOADS

SEC. 701. (a) For the fiscal years 1988 and 1989, the components of the Armed Forces are authorized average military training student loads as may be necessary.

(b) The average military student loads for the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force and the reserve components authorized in subsection (a) for the fiscal years 1988 and 1989 shall be adjusted consistent with the manpower strengths authorized in titles V and VI of this Act. Such adjustment shall be apportioned among the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force and the reserve components in such manner as the Secretary of Defense shall prescribe.

General Counsel of the Department of Defense,
Washington, DC, February 14, 1986.

Hon. George Bush,
President of the Senate,
Washington, DC.

Dear Mr. President: Enclosed is a draft of legislation "To authorize certain construction at military installations for Fiscal Year 1987, and for other purposes." The Office of Management and Budget advises that enactment of this legislation would be in accordance with the President's Budget for Fiscal Year 1987. Appropriations in support of Titles I through VII of this legislation are discussed in that Budget.

This proposal would authorize appropriations for new construction and family housing support for the Active Forces as follows: $3,445,216,000 for the Department of the Army, $2,588,293,000 for the Department of the Navy, $2,563,229,000 for the Department of the Air Force, and $692,200,000 for the Defense Agencies. Included in Title I is authorization for construction of production base support at Army Ammunition Facilities. Title V would authorize $247,000,000 for the United States' share of the NATO Infrastructure Program. Title VII, totaling $451,200,000 would authorize appropriations for the Guard and Reserve Forces.

In addition to the authorization for appropriations, Title VI contains recurring administrative provisions applicable to the Military Construction Program in accordance with chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code. Title VIII contains nonrecurring general provisions. Title IX provides authorization for Fiscal Year 1988 to meet the basic requirements of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, as amended.

The projects that would be authorized by this proposal have been reviewed to determine if environmental impact statements are required by Public Law 91-190; required environmental statements will be submitted by the Congress by the Military Departments.

Sincerely,

H. Lawrence Garrett, III.

Enclosure.

A BILL To authorize certain construction at military installations for fiscal year 1987, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE

This Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Authorization Act, 1987".

TITLE I—ARMY

SEC. 101. AUTHORIZED ARMY CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of the Army may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations inside the United States:

UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES COMMAND

Camp Dawson, West Virginia, $8,700,000.
Fort Bragg, North Carolina, $24,600,000.
Fort Campbell, Kentucky, $21,240,000.
Fort Carson, Colorado, $11,300,000.
Fort Devens, Massachusetts, $20,800,000.
Fort Drum, New York, $615,000,000.
Fort Hood, Texas, $13,350,000.
Fort Irwin, California, $2,870,000.
Fort Lewis, Washington, $25,980,000.
Fort McPherson, Georgia, $2,900,000.
Fort Ord, California, $6,550,000.
Fort Polk, Louisiana, $27,000,000.
Fort Richardson, Alaska, $11,200,000.
Fort Riley, Kansas, $12,500,000.
Fort Sam Houston, Texas, $3,700,000.
Fort Sheridan, Illinois, $2,050,000.
Fort Stewart, Georgia, $1,550,000.
Fort Wainwright, Alaska, $126,700,000.
Presidio of San Francisco, California, $5,100,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY WESTERN COMMAND

Hawaii Various, $12,000,000.
Wheeler Army Air Field, Hawaii, $2,900,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY TRAINING AND DOCTRINE COMMAND

Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, $800,000.
Fort Belvoir, Virginia, $5,600,000.
Fort Benning, Georgia, $16,180,000.
Fort Eustis, Virginia, $2,050,000.
Fort Jackson, South Carolina, $1,300,000.
Fort Knox, Kentucky, $3,200,000.
Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, $1,100,000.
Fort Lee, Virginia, $17,600,000.
Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, $43,200,000.
Fort McClellan, Alabama, $540,000.
Fort Rucker, Alabama, $44,500,000.
Fort Sill, Oklahoma, $3,050,000.
Fort Story, Virginia, $2,700,000.

MILITARY DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

Fort Myer, Virginia, $3,800,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, $42,750,000.
Anniston Army Depot, Alabama, $1,950,000.
Badger Army Ammunition Plant, Wisconsin, $980,000.
Corpus Christi Army Depot, Texas, $10,550,000.
Detroit Arsenal, Michigan, $1,350,000.
Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, $12,900,000.
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, $4,900,000.
Fort Wingate, New Mexico, $350,000.
Harry Diamond Laboratory, Maryland, $680,000.
Hawthorne Army Ammunition Plant, Nevada, $7,000,000.
Letterkenny Army Depot, Pennsylvania, $1,900,000.
Lexington-Blue Grass Depot Activity, Kentucky, $540,000.
Navajo Depot Activity, Arizona, $3,900,000.
Pueblo Depot Activity, Colorado, $600,000.
Red River Army Depot, Texas, $1,350,000.
Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, $19,500,000.
Savanna Army Depot, Illinois, $320,000.
Seneca Army Depot, New York, $1,100,000.
Sierra Army Depot, California, $2,450,000.
Tooele Army Depot, Utah, $1,850,000.
Umatilla Depot Activity, Oregon, $1,050,000.
Yuma Proving Ground, Arizona, $820,000.

AMMUNITION FACILITIES

Holston Army Ammunition Plant, Tennessee, $11,280,000.
Indiana Army Ammunition Plant, Indiana, $1,560,000.
Kansas Army Ammunition Plant, Kansas, $1,050,000.
Lake City Army Ammunition Plant, Missouri, $370,000.
Milan Army Ammunition Plant, Tennessee, $610,000.
Radford Army Ammunition Plant, Virginia, $19,750,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY INFORMATION SYSTEMS COMMAND

Fort Huachuca, Arizona, $17,200,000.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

U.S. Military Academy, New York, $28,500,000.

MILITARY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT COMMAND

Sunny Point Military Ocean Terminal, North Carolina, $650,000.

ASSISTANT CHIEF OF ENGINEERS

Classified, United States, $7,400,000.

(b) Outside the United States.—The Secretary of the Army may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations outside the United States:

UNITED STATES ARMY, JAPAN

Kawakami, Japan, $1,200,000.

EIGHTH UNITED STATES ARMY

Camp Carroll, Korea, $1,740,000.
Camp Casey, Korea, $24,940,000.
Camp Castle, Korea, $4,800,000.
Camp Essayons, Korea, $3,000,000.
Camp Greaves, Korea, $3,990,000.
Camp Hovey, Korea, $9,000,000.
Camp Howze, Korea, $5,850,000.
Camp Humphreys, Korea, $16,800,000.
Camp Jackson, Korea, $1,800,000.
Camp Laguardia, Korea, $2,970,000.
Camp Libby, Korea, $1,100,000.
Camp Liberty Bell, Korea, $780,000.
Camp Long, Korea, $5,600,000.
Camp Market, Korea, $540,000.
Camp Nimble, Korea, $1,950,000.
Camp Page, Korea, $1,400,000.
Camp Pelham, Korea, $2,280,000.
Camp Red Cloud, Korea, $4,550,000.
Camp Stanley, Korea, $4,700,000.
H220, Korea, $2,750,000.
K-16 Army Airfield, Korea, $2,520,000.
Pusan, Korea, $12,940,000.
Second Infantry, Korea, $5,150,000.
Taegu, Korea, $4,900,000.
Yongsan, Korea, $8,760,000.

BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS COMMAND

Kwajalein, $20,600,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES COMMAND, OVERSEAS

Panama, $420,000.
Classified, $4,000,000.
Various, $4,900,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY EUROPE AND SEVENTH ARMY

Ansbach, Germany, $1,790,000.
Aschaffenburg, Germany, $7,000,000.
Bad Kreuznach, Germany, $10,200,000.
Bamberg, Germany, $18,000,000.
Baumholder, Germany, $30,850,000.
Bitburg, Germany, $19,920,000.
Einsiedlerhof, Germany, $4,750,000.
Frankfurt, Germany, $3,500,000.
Fulda, Germany, $1,000,000.
Giessen, Germany, $22,570,000.
Goeppingen, Germany, $1,850,000.
Hanau, Germany, $26,150,000.
Heidelberg, Germany, $1,600,000.
Heilbronn, Germany, $2,100,000.
Hohenfels, Germany, $8,800,000.
Kaiserslautern, Germany, $1,400,000.

Karlsruhe, Germany, $10,000,000.
Manheim, Germany, $2,450,000.
Neu Ulm, Germany, $26,050,000.
Nuernberg, Germany, $5,500,000.
Rheinberg, Germany, $35,610,000.
Schweinfurt, Germany, $39,000,000.
Stuttgart, Germany, $820,000.
Various, Germany, $19,350,000.
Vilseck, Germany, $69,620,000.
Wildflecken, Germany, $3,800,000.
Wuerburg, Germany, $1,900,000.
Drama Remote Site, Greece, $730,000.
Katsimidhi Site, Greece, $560,000.
Zelo, Italy, $610,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY INTELLIGENCE AND SECURITY COMMAND, OVERSEAS

Location 177, $1,950,000.
Location 276, $3,700,000.
Location 280, $2,100,000.

SEC. 102. FAMILY HOUSING.

The Secretary of the Army may construct or acquire Family Housing units (including acquisition of land) at the following installations in the number of units shown, and in the amount shown, for each installation:

Fort Wainwright, Alaska, one hundred and fifty units, $33,000,000.

Fort Irwin, California, thirty-eight manufactured home spaces, $730,000.

Fort Ord, California, three hundred and eighty-five units, $34,000,000.

Crailsheim, Germany, forty units, $4,100,000.

Darmstadt, Germany, forty units, $3,150,000.

Erlangen, Germany, one hundred and six units, $9,400,000.

Herzo Base, Germany, thirty-four units, $3,300,000.

Mainz, Germany, twenty units, $1,850,000.

Schweinfurt, Germany, ninety units, $8,400,000.

Vilseck, Germany, two hundred and twenty-four units, $21,000,000.

Wildflecken, Germany, twenty-four units, $2,050,000.

Various Locations, Germany, one hundred and twenty units, funded under Section 103.

Livorno, Italy, ninety units, $7,700,000.

Fort Polk, Louisiana, five hundred and eighty-three units, $37,000,000.

Kwajalein, Marshall Island, one hundred and thirty-six units, $23,000,000.

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, one hundred and forty units and seventy manufactured home spaces, $10,800,000.

Fort Drum, New York, one thousand and two hundred units, $91,000,000.

Seneca Army Depot, New York, thirty units, $2,900,000.

SEC. 103. IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS

(a) AMOUNT AUTHORIZED.—Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Army may make expenditures to improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $146,000,000 and may make additional expenditures not to exceed $10,460,000 for energy conservation projects using funds generated from prior years' savings.

(b) WAIVER OF MAXIMUM PER UNIT COST FOR CERTAIN IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the maximum amount per unit for an improvement project under section 2825(b) of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Army may carry out projects to improve existing military family housing units at the following installations in the number of units shown, and in the amount shown, for each installation:

Fort Huachuca, Arizona, thirty-eight units, $1,710,000.

Aschaffenburg, Germany, one hundred and forty-four units, $4,240,000.

Aschaffenburg, Germany, forty-eight units, $2,640,000.

Bremerhaven, Germany, twenty-four units, $1,320,000.

Karlsruhe, Germany, twenty-four units, $1,320,000.

Kitzingen, Germany, one hundred and two units, $5,610,000.

Mainz, Germany, one unit, $60,000.

Worms, Germany, six units, $330,000.

Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana, one hundred and sixty-six units, $4,753,000.

Pusan, Korea, forty-eight units, $2,237,000.

Yongsan, Korea, one unit, $70,000.

Fort Indiantown Gap, Pennsylvania, six units, $166,000.

Fort Sam Houston, Texas, twenty-three units, $930,000.

Fort Myer, Virginia, three units, $140,000.

SEC. 104. FORT DRUM, NEW YORK

The Secretary of the Army may, in advance of the availability of the appropriations authorized to be appropriated by subsection 601(b), enter into one or more contracts for the military construction projects authorized by section 101 to be accomplished at Fort Drum, New York, provided that such contracts limit the government's liability to the appropriations then available for obligation under each contract. Such construction may be accomplished by using one-step, turn-key selection procedures, or other competitive contracting methods.

TITLE II—NAVY

SEC. 201. AUTHORIZED NAVY CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of the Navy may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations inside the United States.

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

Headquarters Marine Corps, Arlington, Virginia, $3,020,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina, $4,990,000.

Camp H.M. Smith, Oahu, Hawaii, $2,070,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, $39,120,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Camp Pendleton, California, $10,410,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, $37,140,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, $15,510,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California, $13,450,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Hawaii, $40,720,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, New River, North Carolina, $21,710,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina, $1,870,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, California, $8,440,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Tustin, California, $14,910,000.

Marine Corps Air-Ground Combat Center, Twentynine Palms, California, $37,630,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, $8,410,000.

SPACE AND NAVAL WARFARE SYSTEMS COMMAND

Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Center, Portsmouth, Virginia, $1,870,000.

CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland, $2,660,000.

Navy Tactical Interoperability Support Activity, Long Beach, California, $510,000

Naval Legal Service Office, Norfolk, Virginia, $1,080,000.

Naval Legal Service Office Detachment, Oceana, Virginia, $540,000.

Commandant Naval District, Washington, District of Columbia, $26,000,000.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, ATLANTIC FLEET

Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine, $3,320,000.

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida, $8,640,000.

Naval Station, Charleston, South Carolina, $1,400,000.

Naval Ocean Processing Facility, Dam Neck, Virginia, $540,000.

Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida, $9,030,000.

Naval Air Station, Key West, Florida $10,140,000.

Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Virginia, $6,970,000.

Naval Station, Mayport, Florida, $880,000.

Naval Supply Center Detachment, Mayport, Florida, $3,730,000.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, $16,880,000.

Naval Station, New York, New York, $62,200,000.

Fleet Intelligence Center Europe and Atlantic, Norfolk, Virginia, $1,880,000.

Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia, $1,570,000

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, PACIFIC FLEET

Naval Air Station, Adak, Alaska, $24,400,000.

Naval Facility, Adak, Alaska, $5,700,000.

Naval Air Station, Alameda, California, $18,625,000.

Naval Submarine Base, Bangor, Washington, $15,230,000.
Trident Refit Facility, Bangor, Washington, $1,570,000.
Naval Air Station, Barbers Point, Hawaii, $25,300,000.
Naval Facility, Centerville Beach, California, $1,370,000.
Naval Amphibious Base, Coronado, California, $16,070,000.
Naval Station, Everett, Washington, $95,400,000.
Naval Air Station, Fallon, Nevada, $35,200,000.
Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California. $980,000.
Naval Station, Long Beach, California, $10,990,000.
Naval Magazine, Lualualei, Hawaii, $4,350,000.
Naval Station, Mare Island, California, $470,000.
Naval Air Station, Miramar, California, $21,900,000.
Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $3,240,000.
Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $690,000.
Naval Station, San Diego, California, $19,460,000.
Naval Submarine Base, San Diego, California, $9,100,000.
Naval Station, Seattle, Washington, $2,950,000.
Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington, $5,180,000.

CHIEF OF NAVAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas, $690,000.

Fleet Combat Training Center, Atlantic, Dam Neck, Virginia, $820,000.

Naval Guided Missile School, Dam Neck, Virginia, $3,140,000.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, $5,300,000.

Naval Construction Training Center, Gulfport, Mississippi, $1,180,000.

Naval Air Station, Kingsville, Texas, $3,780,000.

Combat Systems Technical Schools Command, Mare Island, California, $5,200,000.

Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee, $17,380,000.

Naval Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi, $4,660,000.

Naval Submarine School, New London, Connecticut, $9,540,000.

Naval Education and Training Center, Newport, Rhode Island, $11,700,000.

Surface Warfare Officers School Command, Newport, Rhode Island, $8,840,000.

Fleet Training Center, Norfolk, Virginia, $5,400,000.

Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida, $15,170,000.

Naval Diving and Salvage Training Center, Panama City, Florida, $2,850,000.

Naval Technical Training Center, Pensacola, Florida, $7,360,000.

Naval Construction Training Center, Port Hueneme, California, $4,710,000.

Fleet Intelligence Training Center, Pacific, San Diego, California, $4,220,000.

Fleet Training Center, San Diego, California, $3,930,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, California, $12,870,000.

Naval Technical Training Center, San Francisco, California, $9,820,000.

Naval Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida, $2,120,000

NAVAL MEDICAL COMMAND

Naval Hospital, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, $1,670,000.

Naval Hospital, Pensacola, Florida, $690,000.

CHIEF OF NAVAL PERSONNEL

Naval Weapons Station, Charleston, South Carolina, $16,500,000.

Naval Air Station, Miramar, California, $22,500,000.

NAVAL OCEANOGRAPHY COMMAND

Naval Observatory, Washington, District of Columbia, $980,000.

NAVAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

Naval Communication Area Master Station, Eastern Pacific, Honolulu, Hawaii, $1,080,000.

Naval Communication Station, Stockton, California, $2,750,000.

NAVAL SECURITY GROUP COMMAND

Naval Security Group Activity, Adak, Alaska, $14,600,000.

Naval Security Group Detachment, San Diego, California, $1,570,000.

NAVAL SUPPLY SYSTEMS COMMAND

Naval Supply Center, Bremerton, Washington, $500,000.

Naval Supply Center, Jacksonville, Florida, $830,000.

Navy Ships Parts Control Center, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania, $1,670,000.

Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Virginia, $3,140,000.

Naval Supply Center, Oakland, California, $3,490,000.

Naval Supply Center, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $11,820,000.

Naval Supply Center, San Diego, California, $3,820,000.

NAVAL AIR SYSTEMS COMMAND

Pacific Missile Range Facility, Barking Sands, Kauai, Hawaii, $8,260,000.

Naval Air Rework Facility, Cherry Point, North Carolina, $37,200,000.

Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River, Maryland, $21,140,000.

Naval Air Rework Facility, Pensacola, Florida, $8,050,000.

Pacific Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California, $590,000.

NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND

Naval Air Station, Adak, Alaska, $500,000.

Naval Amphibious Base, Coronado, California, $5,100,000.

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Gulfport, Mississippi, $17,650,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Norfolk, Virginia, $8,740,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $25,690,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Pensacola, Florida, $2,120,000.

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, California, $7,120,000.

Naval Submarine Support Facility, San Diego, California, $300,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, California, $8,250,000.

Navy Public Works Center, San Francisco, California, $450,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, $450,000.

NAVAL SEA SYSTEMS COMMAND

Charleston Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina, $10,810,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Charleston, South Carolina, $6,130,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Concord, California, $790,000.

Naval Weapons Support Center, Crane, Indiana, $6,880,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Earle, New Jersey, $54,760,000.

Naval Ordnance Station, Indian Head, Maryland, $4,180,000.

Naval Undersea Warfare Engineering Station, Keyport, Washington, $5,890,000.

Long Beach Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California, $3,630,000.

Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, Virginia, $5,900,000.

Naval Sea Combat Systems Engineering Station, Norfolk, Virginia, $980,000.

Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Pascagoula, Mississippi, $4,120,000.

Naval Ship System Engineering Station, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, $400,000.

Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, Kittery, Maine, $23,170,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach, California, $6,100,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia, $4,220,000

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL RESEARCH

Naval Weapons Center, China Lake, California, $14,120,000.

Naval Surface Weapons Center, Dahlgren, Virginia, $15,960,000

Naval Coastal Systems Center, Panama City, Florida, $880,000.

Naval Research Laboratory Annex, Quantico, Virginia, $1,500,000.

Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, District of Columbia, $8,730,000.

STRATEGIC SYSTEMS PROJECT OFFICE

Naval Submarine Base, Kings Bay, Georgia, $131,390,000.

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of the Navy may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations outside the United States:

MARINE CORPS

Marine Corps Air Station, Futenma, Okinawa, Japan, $4,270,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Smedley D. Butler, Okinawa, Japan, $8,950,000.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, ATLANTIC FLEET

Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, $2,600,000.

Naval Air Station, Keflavik, Iceland, $27,140,000.

Naval Facility, Keflavik, Iceland, $1,570,000

Atlantic Fleet Weapons Training Facility, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, $4,415,000

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, $7,080,000.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, PACIFIC FLEET

Administrative Support Unit, Bahrain Island, $2,550,000.

Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Republic of the Philippines, $5,300,000.

Mobile Construction Battalion, Camp Covington, Guam, $15,500,000.

Naval Facility, Guam, $820,000.

Naval Supply Depot, Guam, $400,000.

Naval Station, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, $1,710,000.

Naval Supply Depot, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, $290,000.

Naval Ship Repair Facility, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, $1,770,000.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, UNITED STATES NAVAL FORCES EUROPE

Naval Activities, London, United Kingdom, $1,180,000.

Naval Support Activity, Naples, Italy, $25,070,000.

Naval Station, Rota, Spain, $4,600,000.

Naval Air Station, Sigonella, Italy, $1,370,000.

Classified Locations, $15,700,000.

NAVAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

Naval Communications Area Master Station, Western Pacific, Guam, $480,000.

Naval Communications Station, Harold E. Holt, Exmouth, Australia, $2,180,000.

Naval Communications Area Master Station, Mediterranean, Naples, Italy, $8,250,000.

Naval Communications Station, San Miguel, Republic of the Philippines, $470,000.

Naval Communications Station, Thurso, United Kingdom, $350,000.

NAVAL SECURITY GROUP COMMAND

Naval Security Group Activity, Edzell, Scotland, $2,250,000.

Naval Security Group Detachment, Guam, $2,150,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Sabana Seca, Puerto Rico, $790,000.

NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND

Navy Public Works Center, Guam, $1,570,000.

Naval Public Works Center, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, $2,100,000.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL RESEARCH

Naval Underwater Systems Center, Andros Island Bahamas, $3,730,000.

HOST NATION INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT

Various Locations, $300,000.

SEC. 202. FAMILY HOUSING

The Secretary of the Navy may construct or acquire family housing units (including land acquisition) at the following installations in the number of units shown, and in the amount shown, for each installation.

Naval Station, Long Beach, California, three hundred units, $22,900,000.

Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, California, one hundred and twenty-six units, $11,600,000.

Navy Public Works Center, San Francisco, California, three hundred units, $26,450,000.

Marine Corps Air-Ground Combat Center, Twentynine Palms, California, three hundred and ninety-two units and seventy-five mobile home spaces, $35,300,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, one hundred mobile home spaces, $1,800,000.

Naval Station, New York, New York, three hundred units, $28,330,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, seventy-five mobile home spaces, $930,000.

Marine Corps Development and Education Command, Quantico, Virginia, fifty mobile home spaces, $790,000.

Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland, two hundred and fifty units, $48,642,000.

SEC. 203. IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS

(a) Amount Authorized.—Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Navy may make expenditures to improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $51,580,000.

(b) Waiver of Maximum Per Unit Cost for Certain Improvement Projects.—Notwithstanding the maximum amount per unit for an improvement project under 2825(b) of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Navy may carry out projects to improve existing military family housing units at the following installations in the number of units shown, and in the amount shown, for each installation:

Naval Station, Mare Island, Vallejo, California, one hundred units, $5,200,000.

Marine Corps Logistics Base, Albany, Georgia, one unit, $33,300.

Navy Public Works Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, two hundred and ten units, $9,400,000.

Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine, forty-four units, $1,274,600.

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Gulfport, Mississippi, one unit, $28,700.

Naval Air Station, Fallon, Nevada, forty-four units, $1,868,500.

Naval Station, New York, New York, one hundred and twenty units, $9,600,000.

Naval Air Development Center, Warminster, Pennsylvania, six units, $256,800.

Naval Education and Training Center, Newport, Rhode Island, one hundred and eighty-six units, $10,200,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Guam, one unit, $64,700.

Navy Public Works Center, Guam, one hundred and nine units, $10,360,000.

Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam, one hundred units, $9,517,000.

Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam, one unit, $58,600.

SEC. 204. ACQUISITION OF EXISTING HOUSING UNITS ON GUAM

The Secretary of the Navy may acquire, without reimbursement, eighty-nine existing family housing units constructed and used by the Federal Aviation Agency on land in Finegayan, Guam, held by the Navy under the provisions of section 1158 of title 49, United States Code.

TITLE III—AIR FORCE

SEC. 301. AUTHORIZED AIR FORCE CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of the Air Force may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations inside the United States:

AIR FORCE LOGISTICS COMMAND

Hill Air Force Base, Utah, $20,550,000.
Kelly Air Force Base, Texas, $49,900,000.
McClellan Air Force Base, California, $28,900,000.
Newark Air Force Base, Ohio, $3,000,000.
Robins Air Force Base, Georgia, $16,055,000.
Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma, $32,900,000.
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, $19,500,000.

AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND

Arnold Air Force Station, Tennessee, $3,530,000.
Edwards Air Force Base, California $16,400,000.
Eglin Air Force Base, Florida, $2,370,000.
Fort MacArthur, California, $3,000,000.
Hanscom Air Force Base, Massachusetts, $4,000,000.
Patrick Air Force Base, Florida, $2,600,000.
Sunnyvale Air Force Station, California, $2,600,000.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Chanute Air Force Base, Illinois, $11,300,000.
Goodfellow Air Force Base, Texas, $10,000,000.
Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi, $1,970,000.
Lackland Air Force Base, Texas, $21,500,000.
Laughlin Air Force Base, Texas, $3,700,000.
Mather Air Force Base, California, $740,000.
Randolph Air Force Base, Texas, $2,250,000.
Williams Air Force Base, Arizona, $8,700,000.

AIR UNIVERSITY

Gunter Air Force Station, Alabama, $2,900,000.
Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, $5,310,000.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska, $20,790,000.
Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska, $8,170,000.
Galena Airport, Alaska, $11,600,000.
King Salmon Airport, Alaska, $4,050,000.
Shemya Air Force Base, Alaska, $22,300,000.

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

Altus Air Force Base, Oklahoma, $310,000.
Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland, $45,430,000.
Charleston Air Force Base, South Carolina, $6,290,000.
Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico, $11,800,000.
Little Rock Air Force Base, Arkansas, $2,750,000.
McChord Air Force Base, Washington, $11,300,000.
McGuire Air Force Base, New Jersey, $13,595,000.
Norton Air Force Base, California, $1,450,000.
Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina, $3,400,000.
Scott Air Force Base, Illinois, $8,900,000.
Travis Air Force Base, California, $8,200,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii, $5,850,000.

SPACE COMMAND

Cape Cod Air Force Station, Massachusetts, $4,300,000.
Cavalier Air Force Station, North Dakota, $2,820,000.
Falcon Air Force Station, Colorado, $6,400,000.
Peterson Air Force Base, Colorado, $8,630,000.

SPECIAL PROJECT

Various Locations, $37,056,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Base 18, Classified Location, $29,970,000.
Base 43, Classified Location, $5,500,000.
Beale Air Force Base, California, $9,516,000.
Blytheville Air Force Base, Arkansas, $4,410,000.
Carswell Air Force Base, Texas, $490,000.
Castle Air Force Base, California, $2,630,000.
Dyess Air Force Base, Texas, $4,130,000.
Ellsworth Air Force Base, South Dakota, $5,410,000.
Fairchild Air Force Base, Washington, $7,520,000.
F.E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyoming, $8,550,000.
Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, $23,130,000.
Griffiss Air Force Base, New York, $1,590,000.
Grissom Air Force Base, Indiana, $3,850,000.
Holbrook Radar Bomb Score Site, Arizona, $630,000.

K.I. Sawyer Air Force Base, Michigan, $1,730,000.
La Junta Radar Bomb Scoring Site, Colorado, $5,460,000.
Loring Air Force Base, Maine, $13,500,000.
Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana, $3,800,000.
March Air Force Base, California, $14,440,000.
McConnell Air Force Base, Kansas, $35,740,000.
Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota, $33,100,000.
Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, $24,970,000.
Pease Air Force Base, New Hampshire, $2,200,000.
Plattsburgh Air Force Base, New York, $9,610,000.
Vandenburg Air Force Base, California, $2,700,000.
Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri, $10,700,000.
Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan, $11,740,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Avon Park Auxiliary Air Field, Florida, $4,100,000.
Bangor International Airport, Maine, $1,250,000.
Base 37, Classified Location, $14,950,000.
Base 38, Classified Location, $14,710,000.
Base 39, Classified Location, $2,300,000.
Bergstrom Air Force Base, Texas, $5,250,000.
Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona, $15,830,000.
England Air Force Base, Louisiana, $2,300,000.
George Air Force Base, California, $14,550,000.
Holloman Air Force Base, New Mexico, $14,760,000.
Homestead Air Force Base, Florida, $6,550,000.
Indian Springs Auxiliary Air Field, Nevada, $1,700,000.
Langley Air Force Base, Virginia, $9,640,000.
Luke Air Force Base, Arizona, $9,190,000.
MacDill Air Force Base, Florida, $3,730,000.
Moody Air Force Base, Georgia, $900,000.
Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, $14,760,000.
Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, South Carolina, $3,000,000.
Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada, $23,800,000.
Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, North Carolina, $2,760,000.
Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina, $3,700,000.
Tyndall Air Force Base, Florida, $600,000.
Various Locations, CONUS, $2,300,000.
WESTCONUS, $18,500,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

Air Force Academy, Colorado, $5,820,000.

VARIOUS LOCATIONS

Various Energy Conservation Investment Projects, $10,000,000.

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of the Air Force may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations outside the United States:

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

Lajes Field, Portugal, $15,750,000.

Rhein-Main Air Base, Germany, $1,300,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Kadena Air Base, Japan, $7,365,000.
Misawa Air Base, Japan, $10,300,000.
Totsuka Air Base, Japan, $700,000.
Yokosuka Air Base, Japan, $600,000
Yokota Air Base, Japan, $4,900,000.
Camp Humphreys, Korea, $8,300,000.
Camp Red Cloud, Korea, $1,450,000.
Kimhae Air Base, Koreak, $3,620,000.
Kunsan Air Base, Korea, $11,020,000.
Kwang-Ju Air Base, Korea, $600,000.
Osan Air Base, Korea, $17,800,000.
Suwon Air Base, Korea, $3,850,000.
Taegu Air Base, Korea, $5,170,000.
Diego Garcia Air Base, Indian Ocean, $4,700,000.
Clark Air Base, Republic of the Philippines, $61,270,000.
Saipan, $5,200,000.

SPACE COMMAND

Sondrestrom Air Base, Greenland, $5,860,000.
Thule Air Base, Greenland, $9,790,000.
Woomera Air Station, Australia, $2,300,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, $7,600,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Keflavik Naval Air Station, Iceland, $1,600,000.
Masirah, Oman, $3,500,000.
Thumrait, Oman, $3,400,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Florennes Air Base, Belgium, $8,820,000.
Bitburg Air Base, Germany, $5,350,000.
Hahn Air Base, Germany, $15,720,000.
Hessisch Oldendorf Air Station, Germany, $2,000,000.
Lindsey Air Station, Germany, $1,200,000.
Pruem Air Station, Germany, $1,150,000.
Ramstein Air Base, Germany, $73,620,000.
Sembach Air Base, Germany, $7,400,000.
Spangdahlem Air Base, Germany, $9,360,000.
Wueschheim Air Station, Germany, $310,000.
Zweibrucken Air Base, Germany, $10,290,000.
Iraklion Air Station, Greece, $320,000.
Aviano Air Base, Italy, $4,200,000.
Camp Darby, Italy, $270,000.
Comiso Air Station, Italy, $4,010,000.
San Vito Air Station, Italy, $6,240,000.
Morocco, $25,400,000.
Camp New Amsterdam, The Netherlands, $5,250,000.

Woensdrecht Air Base, The Netherlands, $34,300,000.
Torrejon Air Base, Spain, $1,450,000.
Zaragoza Air Base, Spain, $540,000.
Ankara Air Station, Turkey, $6,780,000.
Incirlik Air Base, Turkey, $16,160,000.
Pirinclik Air Station, Turkey, $3,000,000.
Martlesham Heath, United Kingdom, $1,650,000.
RAF Alconbury, United Kingdom, $19,520,000.
RAF Bentwaters, United Kingdom, $10,450,000.
RAF Chicksands, United Kingdom, $950,000.
RAF Croughton, United Kingdom $630,000.
RAF Fairford, United Kingdom, $4,450,000.
RAF Greenham Common, United Kingdom, $2,100,000.
RAF Lakenheath, United Kingdom, $1,700,000.
RAF Mildenhall, United Kingdom, $4,700,000.
RAF Molesworth, United Kingdom, $2,430,000.
RAF Upper Heyford, United Kingdom, $14,000,000
RAF Welford, United Kingdom, $1,590,000.
RAF Wethersfield, United Kingdom, $650,000.
RAF Woodbridge, United Kingdom, $5,050,000.
Base 30, Classified Location, $2,950,000.
Base 33, Classified Location, $4,470,000.
Overseas Classified Location, $11,500,000.
Various Locations, Europe, $3,953,000.

SEC. 302. FAMILY HOUSING

(a) In General.—The Secretary of the Air Force may construct or acquire family housing units (including acquisition of land) at the following installations, in the number of units shown, and in the amount shown, for each installation:

Bitburg Air Base, Germany, three hundred and thirty-two units, $26,415,000.

Hahn Air Base, Germany, one hundred and fifty units, $11,300,000.

Osan Air Base, Korea, one unit, $160,000.

La Junta Air Force Station, Colorado, forty units, $4,000,000.

Beale Air Force Base, California, family housing maintenance shop, $180,000.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona, family housing management office, $300,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, New Jersey, family housing management office, $325,000.

Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina, family housing management office, $300,000.

Edwards Air Force Base, California, twenty-four mobile home spaces, $376,000.

(b) Osan Air Base, Korea.—Notwithstanding the space limitations of section 2826 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Air Force may construct one family housing unit at Osan Air Base, Korea with a maximum net floor area of 3,000 square feet at a cost not to exceed $160,000.

SEC. 303. IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS

(a) Amount Authorized.—Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Air Force may make expenditures to improve existing military family housing units, including energy conservation projects, in an amount not to exceed $58,644,000.

(b) Waiver of Maximum Per Unit Cost for Certain Improvement Projects.—Notwithstanding the maximum amount per unit for an improvement project under section 2825(b) of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Air Force may carry out projects to improve existing military family housing units at the following installations in the number of units shown, and in the amount shown, for each installation:

Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska, eighty-eight units, $6,186,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska, twelve units, $760,000.

Air Force Academy, Colorado, one unit, $120,000.

Peterson Air Force Base, Colorado, four units, $149,000.

MacDill Air Force Base, Florida, one hundred and fifty-eight units, $4,430,000; seven units, $553,000; seventy-one units, $2,103,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Illinois, one hundred and twelve units, $4,690,000.

Barksdale Air Force Base, Louisiana, one hundred and fourteen units, $5,342,000.

Bangor Air Force Station, Maine, one unit, $30,000.

Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland, seven units, $518,000.

Pease Air Force Base, New Hampshire, two hundred units, $7,177,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, New York, twenty-nine units, $2,272,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina, one hundred and twenty-five units, $4,385,000; seventy-four units, $2,598,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Texas, two hundred and three units, $7,478,000.

Lackland Air Force Base, Texas, sixty-four units, $1,920,000.

Randolph Air Force Base, Texas, five units, $402,000.

Reese Air Force Base, Texas, one hundred units, $2,895,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Virginia, five units, $441,000.

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, two hundred units, $14,517,000.

Kadena Air Base, Japan, one hundred units, $5,054,000; three units, $240,000.

TITLE IV—DEFENSE AGENCIES

SEC. 401. AUTHORIZED CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS AND LAND ACQUISITION FOR THE DEFENSE AGENCIES

(a) Inside the United States.—The Secretary of Defense may acquire real property and carry out military construction in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations inside the United States:

DEFENSE COMMUNICATIONS AGENCY

Scott Air Force Base, Illinois, $7,600,000.

Pentagon, Virginia, $2,300,000.

DEFENSE LANGUAGE INSTITUTE

Defense Language Institute, Monterey, California, $5,400,000.

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY

Defense Fuel Support Point, Estero Bay, California, $680,000.

Defense Construction Supply Center, Columbus, Ohio, $860,000.

Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania, $1,290,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Charleston, South Carolina, $460,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Naval Supply Center, Charleston, South Carolina, $5,130,000.

Defense Depot, Memphis, Tennessee, $1,160,000.

Defense Depot, Ogden, Utah, $10,400,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Mukilteo, Washington, $6,360,000.

DEFENSE MAPPING AGENCY

Aerospace Center, St. Louis, Missouri, $16,700,000.

DEFENSE MEDICAL FACILITIES OFFICE

Fort Wainwright, Alaska, $8,800,000.

Edwards Air Force Base, California, $3,950,000.

March Air Force Base, California, $2,350,000.

Fort Ord, California, $530,000.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, $1,900,000.

Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $9,700,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, $30,500,000.

Fort Polk, Louisiana, $2,650,000.

Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland, $2,000,000.

Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi, $3,100,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, New Jersey, $3,800,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico, $25,550,000.

Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, $3,900,000.

Brooks Air Force Base, Texas, $1,850,000.

Fort Hood, Texas, $3,450,000.

Randolph Air Force Base, Texas, $13,700,000.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY

Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, District of Columbia, $3,200,000.

Armed Forces Radiobiology Research Institute, Bethesda, Maryland, $790,000.

Field Command, Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico, $900,000.

JOINT TACTICAL COMMAND, CONTROL, AND COMMUNICATIONS AGENCY

Fort Huachuca, Arizona, $9,890,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

Fort Meade, Maryland, $9,570,000.

Classified Location, $3,000,000.

Classified Location, $4,000,000.

Classified Location, $1,000,000.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Classified Location, $3,000,000.
Pentagon, Virginia, $2,500,000.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SECTION 6 SCHOOLS

Fort McClellan, Alabama, $2,830,000.
Fort Benning, Georgia, $1,080,000.
Robbins Air Force Base, Georgia, $2,440,000.
Fort Campbell, Kentucky, $1,340,000.
Fort Knox, Kentucky, $4,350,000.
Governors Island, New York, $2,600,000.
Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, $1,190,000.
Dahlgren, Virginia, $1,130,000.
Quantico, Virginia, $420,000.

STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE

Edwards Air Force Base, California, $4,140,000.
Pacific Missile Range, Kaui, Hawaii, $2,890,000.
White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, $1,930,000.

UNIFORMED SERVICES UNIVERSITY OF HEALTH SCIENCES

Bethesda, Maryland, $900,000.

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of Defense may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations outside the United States:

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY

Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office, Bitburg, Germany, $650,000.
Defense Fuel Support Point, Chimu Wan, Japan, $6,640,000.
Defense Fuel Support Point, Tsurumi, Japan, $3,520,000.
Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office, Bupyong, Korea, $1,290,000.
Defense Fuel Support Point, Toegeywon, Korea, $1,010,000.

DEFENSE MEDICAL FACILITIES OFFICE

Boeblingen, Germany, $3,650,000.
Grafenwoehr, Germany, $3,950,000.
Karlsruhe, Germany, $6,800,000.
Vilseck, Germany, $5,600,000.
Naples, Italy, $29,300,000.
Camp Edwards, Korea, $1,800,000.
Camp Long, Korea, $1,850,000.
Camp Pelham, Korea, $720,000.
Camp New Amsterdam, The Netherlands, $6,000,000.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DEPENDENT SCHOOLS

Florennes, Belgium, $1,260,000.

Naval Air Station, Bermuda, $4,280,000.
Aschaffenburg, Germany, $6,600,000.
Bad Kissingen, Germany, $1,330,000.
Baumholder, Germany, $1,600,000.
Dexheim, Germany, $2,430,000.
Erlangen, Germany, $3,220,000.
Gelnhausen, Germany, $1,130,000.
Grafenwoehr, Germany, $2,500,000.
Hahn, Germany, $3,470,000.
Heidelberg, Germany, $3,190,000.
Hessisch-Oldendorf, Germany, $2,310,000.
Hohenfels, Germany, $1,190,000.
Kaiserslautern, Germany, $7,880,000.
Nuernberg, Germany, $8,580,000.
Schwaebish Gmuend, Germany, $1,640,000.
Stuttgart, Germany, $4,530,000.
Wuerzburg, Germany, $7,760,000.
Naples, Italy, $19,590,000.
Seoul, Korea, $510,000.
Woensdrecht, The Netherlands, $7,420,000.

STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE

Pacific Missile Range, Kwajalein, $1,340,000.

SEC. 402. FAMILY HOUSING

The Secretary of Defense may construct or acquire three family housing units (including land acquisition) at classified locations in the total amount of $270,000.

TITLE V—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION INFRASTRUCTURE

SEC. 501. AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE TO MAKE CONTRIBUTIONS

The Secretary of Defense may make contributions for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization infrastructure program as provided in section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, in an amount not to exceed the sum of the amount authorized to be appropriated for this purpose in section 605 and the amount collected from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as a result of construction previously financed by the United States.

TITLE VI—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS AND RECURRING ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, ARMY

(a) In General.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1986, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Army in the total amount of $3,445,216,000 as follows:

(1) For military construction projects inside the United States authorized by section 101(a), $927,770,000.

(2) For military construction projects outside the United States authorized by section 101(b), $551,160,000.

(3) For military construction projects inside the United States authorized by section 101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1986, $51,000,000.

(4) For military construction projects outside the United States authorized by section 101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1986, $17,000,000.

(5) For unspecified minor construction projects under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, $20,000,000.

(6) For architectural and engineering services and construction design under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, $131,640,000.

(7) For military family housing functions—

(A) for construction and acquisition of military family housing and facilities, $463,380,000; and

(B) for support of military family housing (including the functions described in section 2833 of title 10, United States Code), $1,277,266,000, of which not more than $31,246,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and Guam, and not more than $142,639,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in foreign countries, and

(C) for the Homeowners Assistance Program as authorized by section 2832 of title 10, United States Code, $6,000,000.

(b) Advance Authorization of Appropriation for Fort Drum, New York.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated in advance for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1986, for the construction authorized to be accomplished at Fort Drum, New York, by subsections 101(a) and 104 of this Act as follows:

(1) $221,000,000 in FY 1988; and

(2) $162,000,000 in FY 1989.

(c) Limitation on Total Cost of Construction Projects Authorized in Title I.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 101 of this Act may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) and subsection (b).

SEC. 602. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NAVY

(a) In General.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1986, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Navy in the total amount of $2,588,293,000 as follows:

(1) For military construction projects inside the United States authorized by section 201(a), $1,428,855,000.

(2) For military construction projects outside the United States authorized by section 201(b), $156,905,000.

(3) For military construction projects at Kings Bay, Georgia, authorized by section 201(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1986, $45,450,000.

(4) For unspecified minor construction projects under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, $15,000,000.

(5) For architectural and engineering services and construction design under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, $143,770,000.

(6) For advances to the Secretary of Transportation for construction of defense access roads under section 210 of title 23, United States Code, $5,400,000.

(7) For military family housing functions—

(A) for construction and acquisition of military family housing and facilities, $230,322,000; and

(B) for support of military housing (including functions described in section 2833 of title 10, United States Code), $562,591,000 of which not more than $5,214,100 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing in the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and Guam, and not more than $17,244,900 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in foreign countries.

(b) LIMITATION OF TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS AUTHORIZED IN TITLE II.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 201 of this Act may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a).

SEC. 603. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, AIR FORCE

(a) IN GENERAL.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1986, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Air Force in the total amount of $2,563,229,000 as follows:

(1) For military construction projects inside the United States authorized by section 301(a), $993,032,000.

(2) For military construction projects outside the United States authorized by section 301(b), $533,828,000.

(3) For unspecified minor construction projects under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, $16,000,000.

(4) For achitectural and engineering services and construction design under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, $127,260,000.

(5) For advances to the Secretary of Transportation for construction of defense access roads under section 210 of title 23, United States Code, $32,700,000.

(6) For military family housing functions—

(A) for construction and acquisition of military family housing and facilities, $109,000,000; and

(B) for support of military housing (including functions described in section 2833 of title 10, United States Code), $751,409,000, of which not more than $5,600,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and Guam, and not more than $74,176,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in the foreign countries.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF UNOBLIGATED FUNDS FOR ENERGY CONSERVATION INVESTMENT.—Military Construction funds appropriated to the Department of the Air Force for fiscal year 1987, and prior years' funds that remain available for obligation for Air Force energy conservation projects, are hereby authorized to be made available for energy conservation projects authorized in section 301 of this Act at various locations in the amount of $10,000,000. The Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall be notified prior to the obligation of funds for such projects.

(c) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS AUTHORIZED IN TITLE III.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 301 may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) and the amount specified in subsection (b).

SEC. 604. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, DEFENSE AGENCIES

(a) IN GENERAL.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1986 for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), in the total amount of $692,200,000 as follows:

(1) For military construction projects inside the United States authorized by section 401(a), $241,160,000.

(2) For military construction projects outside the United States authorized by section 401(b), $166,540,000.

(3) For military construction projects at Fort Meade, Maryland, authorized by section 401(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1986, $53,700,000.

(4) For military construction projects at Fort Lewis, Washington, authorized by section 101(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1985, $72,100,000.

(5) For unspecified minor construction projects under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, $4,000,000.

(6) For construction projects under the contingency construction authority of the Secretary of Defense under section 2804 of title 10, United States Code, $5,000,000.

(7) For Conforming Storage Facilities under the construction authority of section 804 of this Act, $21,400,000.

(8) For architectural and engineering services and construction design under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, $110,700,000.

(9) For military family housing functions—

(A) for construction and acquisition of military family housing and facilities, $270,000; and

(B) for support of military housing (including functions described in section 2833 of title 10, United States Code), $17,330,000, of which not more than $14,027,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in foreign countries.

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS AUTHORIZED IN TITLE IV.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2858 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variations authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 401 may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a).

SEC. 605. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NATO

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1986, for contributions by the Secretary of Defense under section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, for the share of the United States of the cost of construction projects for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Infrastructure Program as authorized by section 501, in the amount of $247,000,000.

SEC. 606. EXPIRATION OF AUTHORIZATIONS; EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PREVIOUS AUTHORIZATIONS

(a) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORIZATIONS AFTER TWO YEARS.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), all authorizations contained in titles I, II, III, IV, and V for military construction projects, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, and contributions to the NATO Infrastructure Program (and authorizations of appropriations therefor contained in sections 601 through 605) shall expire on October 1, 1988, or the date of the enactment of the Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1989, whichever is later.

(2) The provisions of paragraph (1) do not apply to authorizations for military construction projects, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, and contributions to the NATO Infrastructure Program (and authorizations of appropriations therefor), for which appropriated funds have been obligated before October 1, 1988, or the date of the enactment of the Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1989, whichever is later, for construction contracts, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, or contributions to the NATO Infrastructure Program.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 607(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1984 (Public Law 98-115, 97 Stat. 780), authorizations for the following projects authorized in section 101 of that Act, as extended by section 606(b) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1986 (Public Law 99-167, 99 Stat. 983) shall remain in effect until October 1, 1987 or the date of enactment of the Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1988, whichever is later:

(1) Unaccompanied Personnel Housing in the amount of $1,400,000 at Argyroupolis, Greece.

(2) Operations Building in the amount of $370,000 at Argyroupolis, Greece.

(3) Multi-Purpose Recreation Facility in the amount of $480,000 at Argyroupolis, Greece.

(4) Unaccompanied Officer Housing in the amount of $600,000 at Perivolaki, Greece.

(5) Operations Building in the amount of $410,000 at Perivolaki, Greece.

(6) Multi-Purpose Recreation Facility in the amount of $620,000 at Perivolaki, Greece.

(7) Physical Fitness Training Center in the amount of $1,000,000 at Elefsis Greece.

(c) Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 1985 Projects.—Notwithstanding the provisions of section 607(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1985 (Public Law 98-407, 98 Stat. 1515), authorizations for the following projects authorized in sections 101, 201, 301, and 401 of that Act shall remain in effect until October 1, 1987, or the date of enactment of the Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1988, whichever is later:

(1) Barracks with Dining Facility in the amount of $11,400,000 at Presidio of San Francisco, California.

(2) Child Care Center in the amount of $1,980,000 at Presidio of San Francisco, California.

(3) Barracks in the amount of $6,600,000 at Presidio of San Francisco, California.

(4) Multi-Purpose Recreation Facility in the amount of $1,150,000 at Koropi, Greece.

(5) Multi-Purpose Recreation Facility in the amount of $960,000 at Katsimidi, Greece.

(6) Unaccompanied Personnel Housing in the amount of $1,100,000 at Yiannitsa, Greece.

(7) Barracks Modernization in the amount of $660,000 at Argyroupolis, Greece.

(8) Unaccompanied Personnel Housing in the amount of $1,800,000 at Drama, Greece.

(9) Barracks Modernization in the amount of $660,000 at Perivolaki, Greece.

(10) Barracks with Dining Facility in the amount of $2,350,000 at Elefsis, Greece.

(11) Multi-purpose Recreation Facility in the amount of $1,050,000 at Yiannitsa, Greece.

(12) Contingency Facility in the amount of $4,300,000 at Palmerola, Honduras.

(13) Unaccompanied Enlisted Personnel Housing in the amount of $10,740,000 at the Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona.

(14) Antenna Support Facility in the amount of $320,000 at the Naval Security Group Activity, Adak, Alaska.

(15) Data Processing Center in the amount of $6,160,000 at the Naval Supply Center, Bremerton, Washington.

(16) Unaccompanied Enlisted Personnel Housing in the amount of $12,130,000 at the Naval Station, Whidbey Island, Washington.

(17) Unaccompanied Enlisted Personnel Housing in the amount of $6,600,000 at the Naval Air Station, Mare Island, Vallejo, California.

(18) Mountain Warfare Training Facility (Bridgeport) in the amount of $1,480,000 for the Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California.

(19) Medical/Dental Clinic (Bridgeport) in the amount of $1,410,000 for the Naval Hospital, Camp Pendleton, California.

(20) Hospital Modernization in the amount of $29,140,000 at the Naval Hospital, Oakland, California.

(21) Facility Energy Improvements in the amount of $5,770,000 at the Navy Public Works Center, San Francisco, California.

(22) Cadet Gymnasium in the amount of $10,000,000 at the United States Air Force Academy, Colorado.

(23) GLCM—Clothing Sales Store in the amount of $300,000 at Comiso Air Base, Italy.

(24) GLCM—Library in the amount of $570,000 at Florennes AB, Belgium.

(25) Anti-Satellite Facilities in the total amount of $16,500,000 at Langley Air Force Base, Virginia to include: Integrated Maintenance Facility for $9,870,000; Missile and Motor Storage Facility for $3,870,000; Administrative Building for $645,000; Hydrazine Storage for $370,000; Control Center for $860,000; and Cryogen Storage and Procurement Facility for $955,000.

SEC. 607. ESTABLISHMENT OF CERTAIN AMOUNTS REQUIRED TO BE SPECIFIED BY LAW

For projects or contracts initiated during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending on the date of the enactment of the Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1988 or October 1, 1987, whichever is later, the following amounts apply:

(1) The maximum amount for an unspecified minor military construction project under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, is $2,000,000.

(2) The amount of a contract for architectural and engineering services or construction design that makes such a contract subject to the reporting requirement under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, is $300,000.

(3) The maximum amount per unit for an improvement project for family housing units under section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, is $30,000.

(4) The maximum annual rental for a family housing unit leased in the United States, Puerto Rice, or Guam under section 2828(b) of title 10, United States Code, is $10,000.

(5)(A) The maximum annual rental for a family housing unit leased in a foreign country under section 2828(e)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is $16,800.

(B) The maximum number of family housing units that may be leased at any one time in foreign countries under section 2828(e)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is 34,500.

(6) The maximum rental per year for family housing facilities, or for real property related to family housing facilities, leased in a foreign country under section 2828(f) of title 10, United States Code, is $250,000.

TITLE VII—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

SEC. 701. AUTHORIZATION FOR GUARD AND RESERVE FACILITIES

There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1986, for the costs of acquisition, architectural and engineering services, and construction of facilities for the Guard and Reserve Forces, and for contributions therefor, under chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code (including the cost of acquisition of land for those facilities), the following amounts:

(1) For the Department of the Army—

(A) for the Army National Guard of the United States, $121,100,000, and

(B) for the Army Reserve, $86,700,000.

(2) For the Department of the Navy, for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, $44,500,000.

(3) For the Department of the Air Force—

(A) for the Air National Guard of the United States, $140,000,000, and

(B) for the Air Force Reserve, $58,900,000.

TITLE VIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

CONSTRUCTION OF POSTAL FACILITIES

SEC. 801. (a) Section 4779 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by (1) striking out subsection (b), and (2) changing subsection (c) to subsection (b).

(b) Section 9779 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by (1) striking out subsection (b), and (2) changing subsection (c) to subsection (b).

RENOVATION OF FACILITIES

SEC. 802. (a) Chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of subchapter I the following new section:

"§ 2810. Renovation of facilities

"(a) The Secretary concerned may carry out renovation projects that combine maintenance, repair, and minor construction projects for an entire single-purpose facility, or one or more functional areas of a multipurpose facility, using funds available for operations and maintenance.

"(b) The maximum amount authorized to be obligated on each such renovation project shall not exceed the maximum amount specified by law for a minor construction project.

"(c) Construction of new facilities or additions to existing facilities may not be carried out under the authority of this section."

(b) The table of sections at the beginning of such subchapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"2810. Renovation of Facilities.".

OVERSEAS FAMILY HOUSING

SEC. 803. Subsection 2828(e)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by deleting the number "200" and inserting in lieu thereof, the number "220".

HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE

SEC. 804. (a) In order to meet the pressing need for the storage of hazardous and toxic materials and wastes on military installations, the Secretary of Defense may, using funds available for military construction, carry out military construction projects not otherwise authorized by law for the construction of hazardous waste storage facilities.

(b) When a decision is made to carry out a project under this section, the Secretary of Defense shall notify in writing the appropriate committees of Congress of that decision, of the justification for the project, and of the estimated cost of the project. The project may then be carried out only after the end of the 21-day period beginning on the date the notification is received by the committees.

(c) The cost of a hazardous waste storage facility project authorized by this section may be increased by not more than 25 percent of the estimated cost of the project as contained in the notification provided to the committees pursuant to subsection (b) if the Secretary of Defense determines (A) that such an increase is required for the sole purpose of meeting unusual variations in cost, and (B) that such variations in cost could not have been reasonably anticipated at the time the project justification was originally submitted to the committees.

(d) As used in this section, the term hazardous waste includes both excess hazardous materials and hazardous wastes as defined by applicable laws and regulations.

(e) A project for the construction of hazardous waste storage facilities under this section may, notwithstanding any other provision of law, including but not limited to the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. § 6901 et seq.), be commenced at the time the Secretary of Defense files an application for a permit to conduct the storage of hazardous wastes with the appropriate Federal or State agency, provided, that the operation of any facility constructed under the authority of this section may not commence until the issuance of appropriate permits.

(f) No military construction project for the erection of a hazardous waste storage facility may be commenced under the authority of this section after September 30, 1991.

INCREASE CONTRACT THRESHOLDS

SEC. 805. Contracts awarded by the Department of Defense estimated to cost $25,000 or less for the maintenance, repair, and construction of facilities need not meet the requirements for publication mandated by (1) section 18 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act, as amended by section 303 of the Small Business and Federal Procurement Competition Enhancement Act of 1984, and (2) section 8 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. § 637), as amended by section 404 of the Small Business and Federal Procurement Competition Enhancement Act of 1984.

MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING

SEC. 806. (a) Subsections (g)(7), (8), and (9) of section 2828 of title 10, United States Code, are hereby repealed.

(b) Subsections (f), (g), and (h) of section 802 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1984, Public Law 98-115, as amended, are hereby repealed.

TITLE IX

SEC. 901. There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1988 such sums as may be necessary for the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force to establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY,
Washington, DC, March 10, 1986.

Hon. GEORGE BUSH,
President of the Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is proposed legislation entitled the "National Security Programs Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1987 and 1988". This bill would authorize specific appropriations for FY 87 and such sums as may be necessary for FY 88. The total amount that would be authorized in title I for FY 87 is $8,098,400,000, of which $6,523,694,000 is for operating expenses, $1,027,241,000 is for construction projects, and $547,465,000 is for capital equipment.

Title II sets forth general provisions that would govern reprogramming of funds, general plant projects, construction projects, fund transfers, construction designs, and availability of funds.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that enactment of this legislative proposal would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

J. MICHAEL FARRELL, *General Counsel.*

Enclosure.

A BILL To authorize appropriations for the Department of Energy for national security programs for fiscal year 1987 and fiscal year 1988, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Security Programs Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1987 and 1988."

TITLE I—NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

OPERATING EXPENSES

SEC. 101. Funds are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 1987 for operating expenses incurred in carrying out national security programs (including scientific research and development in support of the Armed Forces, strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense, and military applications of nuclear energy and related management and support activities) as follows:

(1) For weapons activities, $3,752,554,000.
(2) For materials production, $1,596,390,000.
(3) For defense waste and byproducts management, $455,050,000.
(4) For verification and control technology, $95,500,000.
(5) For nuclear safeguards and security, $61,100,000.
(6) For security investigations, $33,300,000.

(7) For naval reactors development, $529,800,000.

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

SEC. 102. Funds are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 1987 for plant and capital equipment (including planning, construction, acquisition, and modification of facilities, land acquisition related thereto, and acquisition and fabrication of capital equipment not related to construction) necessary for national security programs as follows:

(1) For weapons activities:

Project 87-D-101, general plant projects, various locations, $29,000,000.

Project 87-D-121, general plant projects, various locations, $32,000,000.

Project 87-D-102, environmental compliance and cleanup, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California and Site 300, California, $7,000,000.

Project 87-D-104, safeguards and security enhancements, Phase II, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California, $4,300,000.

Project 87-D-122, short-range attack missile II (SRAM II) warhead production facilities, various locations, $5,000,000.

Project 87-D-123, protective clothing decontamination facility, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, Colorado, $500,000.

Project 87-D-127, environmental, safety, and health upgrade, Mound Plant, Miamisburg, Ohio, $2,400,000.

Project 87-D-130, receiving and shipping facility, Pinellas Plant, St. Petersburg, Florida, $300,000.

Project 86-D-103, decontamination and waste treatment facility, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California, $5,300,000, for a total project authorization of $9,000,000.

Project 86-D-104, strategic defenses facility, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, New Mexico, $13,000,000, for a total project authorization of $17,000,000.

Project 86-D-105, instrumentation systems laboratory, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, New Mexico, $5,800,000, for a total project authorization of $12,000,000.

Project 86-D-106, laboratory data communications center, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico, $12,000,000, for a total project authorization of $15,000,000.

Project 86-D-122, structural upgrade of existing plutonium facilities, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, Colorado, $2,420,000, for a total project authorization of $5,420,000.

Project 86-D-123, environmental hazards elimination, various locations, $16,840,000, for a total project authorization of $25,540,000.

Project 86-D-124, safeguards and site security upgrading, Phase II, Mound Plant, Miamisburg, Ohio, $1,880,000, for a total project authorization of $4,880,000.

Project 86-D-125, safeguards and site security upgrade, Phase II, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, Texas, $8,410,000, for a total project authorization of $9,910,000.

Project 86-D-130, Tritium loading facility replacement, Savannah River Plant, Aiken, South Carolina, $29,700,000, for a total project authorization of $34,700,000.

Project 85-D-102, nuclear weapons research, development, and testing facilities revitalization, Phase I, various locations, $29,950,000, for a total project authorization of $130,750,000.

Project 85-D-103, safeguards and security enhancements, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and Sandia National Laboratories, Livermore, California, $6,500,000, for a total project authorization of $27,600,000.

Project 85-D-105, combined device assembly facility, Nevada Test Site, Las Vegas, Nevada, $9,400,000, for a total project authorization of $24,000,000.

Project 85-D-106, hardened engineering test building, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California, $330,000, for a total project authorization of $3,030,000.

Project 85-D-112, enriched uranium recovery improvements, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, $19,000,000, for a total project authorization of $38,800,000.

Project 85-D-113, power plant and steam distribution system, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, Texas, $1,790,000, for a total project authorization of $24,790,000.

Project 85-D-115, renovate plutonium building utility systems, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, Colorado, $13,440,000, for a total project authorization of $34,040,000.

Project 85-D-121, air and water pollution control facilities, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, $9,160,000, for a total project authorization of $28,160,000.

Project 85-D-125, tactical bomb production facilities, various locations, $12,800,000, for a total project authorization of $28,800,000.

Project 84-D-102, radiation-hardened integrated circuit laboratory, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, New Mexico, $3,000,000, for a total project authorization of $40,500,000.

Project 84-D-107, nuclear testing facilities revitalization, various locations, $13,300,000, for a total project authoriation of $79,240,000.

Project 84-D-112, TRIDENT II warhead production facilities, various locations, $14,500,000, for a total project authorization of $155,200,000.

Project 84-D-113, antisubmarine warfare/standoff weapon warhead production facilities, various locations, $42,000,000, for a total project authorization of $52,000,000.

Project 84-D-124, environmental improvements, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, $9,280,000, for a total authorization of $38,280,000.

Project 84-D-211, safeguards and site security upgrading, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, $27,220,000, for a total project authorization of $50,220,000.

Project 82-D-107, utilities and equipment restoration, replacement, and upgrade, Phase III, various locations, $97,904,000, for a total project authorization of $383,304,000.

Project 82-D-144, simulation technology laboratory, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, New Mexico, $6,000,000, for a total project authorization of $40,000,000.

(2) For materials production:

Project 87-D-146, general plant projects, various locations, $35,980,000.

Project 87-D-149, reduced chemical discharges to process sewers, Richland, Washington, $3,150,000.

Project 87-D-150, radioactive liquid effluent treatment facility, partial design only, Richland, Washington, $4,000,000.

Project 87-D-152, environmental protection plantwide, Savannah River, South Carolina, $1,500,000.

Project 87-D-156, reactor effluent cooling water thermal mitigation, Savannah River, South Carolina, $5,000,000.

Project 87-D-159, environmental, health, and safety improvements, Phase I, Feed Materials Production Center, Fernald, Ohio, $10,000,000.

Project 86-D-149, productivity retention program, Phase I & II, various locations, $71,625,000, for a total project authroization of $95,825,000.

Project 86-D-150, in-core neutron monitoring system, N reactor, Richland, Washington, $2,760,000, for a total project authorization of $7,220,000.

Project 86-D-151, PUREX electrical system upgrade, Richland, Washington, $3,780,000, for a total project authorization of $6,280,000.

Project 86-D-152, reactor electrical distribution system, Savannah River, South Carolina, $8,410,000, for a total project authorization of $10,410,000.

Project 86-D-153, additional line III furnace, Savannah River, South Carolina, $7,605,000, for a total project authorization of $9,105,000.

Project 86-D-154, effluent treatment facility, Savannah River, South Carolina, $15,650,000, for a total project authorization of $18,150,000

Project 86-D-156, plantwide safeguards systems, Savannah River, South Carolina, $13,610,000, for a total project authorization of $16,610,000.

Project 86-D-157, hydrofluorination system—FB-line, Savannah River, South Carolina, $2,310,000, for a total project authorization of $4,510,000.

Project 85-D-139, fuel processing restoration, Idaho Fuels Processing Facility, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho, $36,530,000, for a total project authorization of $58,530,000.

Project 85–D–140, productivity and radiological improvements, Feed Materials Production Center, Fernald, Ohio, $23,500,000, for a total project authorization of $41,500,000.

Project 85–D–145, fuel production facility, Savannah River, South Carolina, $33,500,000 for a total project authorization of $59,300,000.

Project 84–D–134, safeguards and security improvements, plantwide, Savannah River, South Carolina, $7,515,000, for a total project authorization of $34,415,000.

Project 84–D–135, process facility modifications, Richland, Washington, $34,475,000, for a total project authorization of $66,975,000.

Project 84–D–136, enriched uranium conversion facility modifications, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, $1,000,000, for a total project authorization of $20,600,000.

Project 82–D–124, restoration of production capabilities, Phases II, III, IV, and V, various locations, $3,511,000, for a total project authorization of $352,045,000.

(3) For defense waste and byproducts management:

Project 87–D–171, general plant projects, interim waste operations and long-term waste management technology, various locations, $26,535,000.

Project 87–D–172, WESF K-3 filter upgrade Richland, Washington, $500,000.

Project 87–D–173, 242–A evaporator crystallizer upgrade, Richland, Washington, $2,800,000.

Project 87–D–174, 241–AQ tank farm, Richland, Washington, $2,100,000.

Project 87–D–175, steam system rehabilitation, phase I, Richland, Washington, $900,000.

Project 87–D–177, test reactor area liquid radioactive waste cleanup system, phase III, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory (INEL), Idaho, $700,000.

Project 87–D–180, burial ground expansion, Savannah River, South Carolina, $6,300,000.

Project 87–D–181, diversion box and pump pit containment buildings, Savannah River, South Carolina, $1,360,000.

Project 86–D–172, B-plant F-filter, Richland, Washington, $2,949,000, for a total project authorization of $3,949,000.

Project 86–D–174, low-level waste processing and shipping system, Feed Materials Production Center, Fernald, Ohio, $9,872,000, for a total authorization of $12,372,000.

Project 85–D–175, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory security upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory (INEL), Idaho, $7,258,000, for a total project authorization of $9,258,000.

Project 85–D–158, central warehouse upgrade, Richland, Washington, $1,044,000, for a total project authorization of $6,744,000.

Project 85–D–159, new waste transfer facilities, Savannah River, South Carolina, $7,318,000, for a total project authorization of $27,318,000.

Project 85-D-160, test reactor area security system upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory (INEL), Idaho, $2,703,000, for a total project authorization of $6,953,000.

Project 81-T-105, defense waste processing facility, Savannah River, South Carolina, $123,967,000, for a total project authorization of $721,467,000.

(4) For verification and control technology:

Project 85-D-171, space science laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico, $2,000,000, for a total project authorization of $7,500,000.

(5) For naval reactors development:

Project 87-N-101, general plant projects, various locations, $4,800,000.

Project 87-N-102, Kesselring site facilities upgrade, Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory, West Milton, New York, $5,000,000.

Project 87-N-103, computation laboratory addition, Bettis Atomic Power Laboratory, West Mifflin, Pennsylvania, $2,300,000.

(6) For capital equipment not related to construction—

(A) for weapons activities, $322,870,000;

(B) for materials production, $126,090,000;

(C) for defense waste and byproducts management, $37,805,000;

(D) for verification and control technology, $4,200,000;

(E) for nuclear safeguards and security, $4,800,000; and,

(F) for naval reactors development, $51,700,000.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

REPROGRAMMING

Sec. 201. Except as otherwise provided in this Act—

(1) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program in excess of 105 percent of the amount authorized for that program by this Act or $10,000,000 more than the amount authorized for that program by this Act, whichever is the lesser, and

(2) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program which has not been presented to, or requested of, the Congress,

unless the Secretary of Energy (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "Secretary") transmits to the appropriate committees of Congress a full and complete statement of the action proposed to be taken with respect to the program and the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of the proposed action.

LIMITS ON GENERAL PLANT PROJECTS

Sec. 202. (a) The Secretary may carry out any construction project under the general plant projects provisions authorized by this Act if the total estimated cost of the construction project does not exceed $1,200,000.

(d) If at any time during the construction of any general plant project authorized by this Act, the estimated cost of the project is revised because of unforeseen cost variations and the revised cost of the project exceeds $1,200,000, the Secretary shall immediately furnish a complete report to the appropriate committees of Congress explaining the reasons for the cost variation.

LIMITS ON CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

SEC. 203. (a) Whenever the current estimated cost of a construction project, which is authorized by section 102 of this Act, or which is in support of national security programs of the Department of Energy and was authorized by any previous Act, exceeds by more than 25 percent the higher of (1) the amount authorized for the project, or (2) the amount of the total estimated cost for the project as shown in the most recent budget justification data submitted to Congress, construction may not be started or additional obligations incurred in connection with the project above the total estimated cost, as the case may be, unless a period of thirty calendar days (not including any day in which either House of Congress is not in session because of adjournment of more than three days to a day certain) has passed after receipt by the appropriate committees of the Congress of written notice from the Secretary containing a full and complete statement of the action proposed to be taken and the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of the action.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to any construction project which has a current estimated cost of less than $5,000,000.

FUND TRANSFER AUTHORITY

SEC. 204. To the extent specified in appropriation Acts, funds appropriated pursuant to this Act may be transferred to other agencies of the Government for the performance of the work for which the funds were appropriated, and funds so transferred may be merged with the appropriations of the agency to which the funds are transferred.

AUTHORITY FOR EMERGENCY CONSTRUCTION DESIGN

SEC. 205. In addition to the advance planning and construction design authorized by section 102, the Secretary may perform planning and design utilizing available funds for any Department of Energy national security program construction project whenever the Secretary determines that the design must proceed expeditiously in order to meet the needs of national defense or to protect property or human life.

FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR ALL NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

SEC. 206. Subject to the provisions of appropriation Acts, amounts appropriated pursuant to this Act for management and support activities and for general plant projects are available for use, when necessary, in connection with all national security programs of the Department of Energy.

AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS

SEC. 207. When so specified in an appropriation Act, amounts appropriated for "Operating Expenses" or for "Plant and Capital Equipment" may remain available until expended.

TITLE III—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1988

SEC. 301. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy to be available not earlier than October 1, 1987, such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1988 for programs set forth in this Act.

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY,
Washington, DC, February 5, 1986.

Hon. GEORGE BUSH,
President of the Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is proposed legislation "To authorize appropriations for civil defense programs for Fiscal Years 1987 and 1988."

In accordance with section 408 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2260), the bill authorizes appropriations of $126,565,000 for civil defense programs for Fiscal Year 1987, and such sums as may be necessary for Fiscal Year 1988.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this proposal for consideration of the Congress and that its enactment would be in accord with the President's program.

Sincerely,

SPENCE W. PERRY, *Acting General Counsel.*

Enclosure.

A BILL To authorize appropriations for civil defense programs for Fiscal Years 1987 and 1988.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, to carry out the provisions of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, the sum of $126,565,000 and for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1988, such sums as may be necessary.

COMMITTEE ACTION

In accordance with the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, there is set forth below the committee vote to report the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1987.

In favor: Senators Goldwater, Thurmond, Warner, Humphrey, Cohen, Quayle, East, Wilson, Denton, Gramm, Nunn, Stennis, Hart, Exon, Levin, Kennedy, Bingaman, Dixon, and Glenn.

Opposed: None.

Vote: 19–0.

The other roll call votes on amendments to the bill which were considered during the course of markup have been made public and are available at the committee.

FISCAL DATA

With respect to 5-year cost projections, under Public Law 91-510, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, certain Senate rules and procedures were revised. Shown below is the legislative language:

> SEC. 252(a)(1) The report accompanying each bill or joint resolution of a public character reported by any committee of the Senate (except the Committee on Appropriations) shall contain—
>
> (A) an estimate, made by such committee, of the costs which would be insured in carrying out such bill or joint resolution in the fiscal year in which it is reported and in each of the five fiscal years following such fiscal year (or for the authorized duration of any program authorized by such bill or joint resolution if less than five years), except that, in the case of measures affecting the revenues, such report shall require only an estimate of the pain or loss in revenues for a one-year period; and
>
> (B) a comparison of the estimate of costs described in subparagraph (A) made by such committee with any estimate of costs made by any Federal agency;
>
> (C) in lieu of such estimate or comparison, or both, a statement of the reason why compliance by the committee with requirements of subparagraph (A) or (B), or both, is impracticable.
>
> (2) It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any such bill or joint resolution if such bill or joint resolution was reported in the Senate after the effective date of this subsection and the report of that committee of the Senate which reported such bill or joint resolution does not comply with the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection.

Below is the letter received in compliance with the legislation. The bill is an annual authorization and does not, within its own terms, generate costs beyond fiscal year 1985 even though the funds authorized to be obligated by this act may not be expended for several years in the future. The fiscal year authorizations herein provided are reviewed annually by the committee and the Congress.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC, March 19, 1986.

Hon. BARRY GOLDWATER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In accordance with Section 252 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 (PL 91-510), the enclosed schedule provides an estimate of how the authorization now requested in fiscal year 1987 will be expended over the fiscal year 1987-1991 period.

The uncertainty of future year Defense programs precludes precise projections, but the enclosed schedule provides my estimate of the range of authorizations required during each of the next four years to support the forces contained in the annual Defense Report on the fiscal year 1987 budget.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. QUETSCH,
Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller).

Enclosure.

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES

Fiscal year 1987 authorization request: $227,931 million—

1987	$127,892
1988	50,897
1989	24,480
1990	13,676
1991	6,838
1992	2,737
Beyond	1,411

I estimate that to support the forces in the Annual Defense Report on the fiscal year 1987 budget, authorization in the range of $253-$324 billion for fiscal years 1988-1991 would be required.

CBO COST ESTIMATE

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, July 7, 1986.

Hon. BARRY GOLDWATER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the attached cost estimate on the National Defense Authorization Act, 1987, as ordered reported by the Senate Committee on Armed Services, on June 25, 1986.

Should the Committee so desire, we would be pleased to provide further details on the attached cost estimate.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

RUDOLPH G. PENNER, *Director.*

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE—COST ESTIMATE

1. Bill number: Unassigned.

2. Bill title: National Defense Authorization Act, 1987.

3. Bill status: As ordered reported by the Senate Committee on Armed Services, on June 25, 1986.

4. Bill purpose: This bill authorizes appropriations for the Armed Forces during fiscal year 1987 for:

The procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, and other weapons;
Research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E);
Operation and maintenance (O&M);
Military Construction;
Atomic Energy Defense Activities;
Civil defense; and
Military personnel and compensation matters.

This bill prescribes authorized personnel strengths for each active duty component, for the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component, and for military training student loads.

The bill includes additional provisions which do not have a significant cost impact.

5. Estimated cost to the Federal Government: This bill would entail costs to the federal government in fiscal years 1987-1991, as shown in the following table.

TABLE 1.—ESTIMATED COSTS OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1987, AS REPORTED BY THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

[By fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

Category	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
Function 050:					
Direct authorizations (table 2):					
Authorized level	225,749				
Estimated outlays	102,793	61,708	28,951	12,724	6,382
Estimated authorizations (table 3):					
Authorized budget authority/authorization level	76,243	−196	−204	−214	−222
Estimated outlays	73,987	2,097	−198	−210	−220
Subtotal—Function 050:					
Estimated authority level	301,992	−196	−204	−214	−222
Estimated outlays	176,780	63,805	28,753	12,514	6,162
Other functions (table 4):					
Estimated budget authority/authorization level	−2,034				
Estimated outlays	−25,561	1			
Bill total:					
Estimated authority/budget authority	299,958	−196	−204	−214	−222
Estimated outlays	151,219	63,807	28,753	12,514	6,162

Totals may not add due to rounding.

Basis for Estimate: All estimates assume that funds will be appropriated for the full amount of the authorization and will be available for obligation by October 1, 1986, unless otherwise specified. Outlays are estimated based on historical outlay rates for the relevant accounts.

The bill states authorizations for appropriations for several accounts totalling $225.7 billion for 1987. (Such authorizations occur annually.) Table 2 shows the costs for each directly authorized account.

In addition, the bill contains several provisions that affect several budget functions and that require CBO to estimate cost impacts for 1987 and the outyears. Table 3 shows the costs of such provisions affecting function 050.

The estimated costs of authorized active and reserve military personnel levels are based on average pay and allowances including an amount for retired pay accrual. The amount included for retirement accrual is based on the military retirement reform bill (P.L. 99-348) signed by the President on July 1, 1986. This act reduced the accrual cost relative to current law by $182 million, but relative to the President's budget it raises the charge by $187 million primarily due to late enactment.

In addition to specifying personnel levels, the bill also authorizes certain changes in military compensation. This bill provides a 4 percent pay raise for military personnel in October 1986. The pay raise authorized in this bill costs $1,127 million in estimated authorizations and $1,093 million in estimated outlays more than the 3 percent January pay raise contained in the budget resolution for 1987. This estimate reflects the full cost of the pay raise, assuming there is no absorption.

The bill provides that the authorization for appropriations be increased for certain increases in costs. One such cost is civilian pay. The budget resolution assumes a pay raise of 3 percent in January.

A raise of this amount would increase the authorization by $559 million assuming that there is no absorption of the raise.

Section 642 of this bill directs that the accrual accounting system for military retirement be changed from a single accrual rate for all personnel to a dual accrual system. Under the dual accrual system, active personnel and full-time reserve personnel would have a higher percentage of basic pay set aside than under current law, while part-time personnel (drilling reservists) would have a lower percentage of basic pay set aside than under current law. The accrual change directly reduces estimated authorizations in function 050 by $506 million, decreasing the resources in the trust fund in function 600 and the offsets in function 950 by a similar amount. Including the effect of this provision on the pay raise and interest paid to the trust fund, the provision has a net budget savings of $549 million in estimated authorizations in fiscal year 1987 compared to current law.

TABLE 2.—DIRECT AUTHORIZATIONS IN THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1987, AS REPORTED BY THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

[By fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

Category	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
Procurement:					
Authorization level	89,849				
Estimated outlays	13,201	28,578	22,524	10,904	6,037
RD&E:					
Authorization level	37,239				
Estimated outlays	18,971	13,307	2,439	869	
O&M:					
Authorization level	81,219				
Estimated outlays	62,891	14,294	1,521		
Military construction:					
Authorization level	8,803				
Estimated outlays	2,334	3,122	1,761	827	344
Stock funds:					
Authorization level	1,097				
Estimated outlays	834	198	66		
Atomic energy defense activities:					
Authorization level	7,425				
Estimated outlays	4,455	2,202	639	123	
Civil defense:					
Authorization level	112				
Estimated outlays	106	6	0	0	0
Other:					
Authorization level	5	0	0	0	0
Estimated outlays	1	1	1	1	[1]
Total:					
Authorization level	225,749				
Estimated outlays	102,793	61,708	28,951	12,724	6,382

[1] Less than $50 million.

TABLE 3.—AUTHORIZATIONS IN FUNCTION 050 IN THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1987, AS REPORTED BY THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

[By fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

Category	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
Endstrengths:					
Estimated authorization level	73,846				
Estimated outlays	71,630	2,216			
4 percent military pay raise:					
Estimated authorization level	2,576				
Estimated outlays	2,499	77			
Potential civilian raise:					
Estimated authorization level	559				
Estimated outlays	550	9			
Accrual accounting change:					
Estimated authorization level	−506				
Estimated outlays	−491	−15			
PCS funding:					
Estimated authorization level	−145				
Estimated outlays	−141	−4			
Service Contract Act:					
Estimated authorization level	−147	−155	−162	−170	−177
Estimated outlays	−140	−154	−161	−169	−177
Davis-Bacon repeal:					
Estimated authorization level	−28	−29	−30	−31	−32
Estimated outlays	−9	−19	−25	−28	−30
Special defense acquisition fund:					
Estimated budget authority	100				
Estimated outlays	100				
Other 050:					
Estimated authorization level	−12	−12	−12	−13	−13
Estimated outlays	−12	−12	−12	−13	−13
Function 050 total:					
Estimated authority/budget authority	76,243	−196	204	−214	222
Estimated outlays	73,987	2,097	−198	−210	220

Totals may not add due to rounding.

Section 617 of the bill would reduce funding levels for permanent change of station allowances by $145 million by anticipating changes proposed by the Department of Defense (DoD) in administrative costs.

The bill contains several other provisions that have net savings in 1987 of $12 million. Provisions raising costs address reimbursement for quarters expenses, aviation continuation pay, a special pay for linguistics specialists, and other allowances. These costs are more than offset by lower costs due primarily to changes in reimbursement for travel expenses.

This bill would amend the Service Contract Act (SCA) to raise the minimum applicable contract size and to eliminate the predecessor contract (sometimes referred to as the successorship) provision as each applies to contracts awarded by the Department of Defense (DoD). The SCA imposes certain restrictions on the wages, fringe benefits, and other working conditions provided by suppliers of services contracted for by the federal government. These restrictions are estimated to increase the costs of services procured by the federal government by about 4 percent.

Raising the current minimum contract size covered by SCA from $2,500 to $1,000,000 on DoD contracts would reduce budget authority needs by $63 million in 1987. This estimate is based on data on the distribution of SCA contracts in 1985, during which about 24 percent of contract volume was in contracts of less than $1 million. The predecessor contract clause requires that wages paid under a service contract cannot be less than those paid under the previous contract for the same work, if the wages and fringe benefits were the result of a collective bargaining agreement. This provision now covers about 8 percent of SCA contracts, and its elimination with respect to DoD contracts would produce estimated savings of $84 million in 1987.

Another provision would raise the minimum contract size, with respect to only DoD contracts, for which the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act (DBA) apply. Based upon data from the Federal Procurement Data file for 1985, the specified increase in the applicable minimum contract size from $2,000 to $250,000 would exempt about 12 percent of the DoD contract volume currently covered under the DBA. Assuming that current DBA requirements increase federal construction costs by 3.3 percent, applying this increase to the CBO's projection of the military construction, housing, and repair spending would save about $28 million in budget authority and about $9 million in outlays in 1987.

TABLE 4.—ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATIONS OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1987, AS REPORTED BY THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE IN FUNCTIONS OTHER THAN 050

[By fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

Category	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
Function 150: Estimated outlays	−100				
Function 400:					
Estimated authorization level	42				
Estimated outlays	41	1			
Function 600:					
Estimated authorization level	23,426				
Estimated outlays	0				
Function 950:					
Estimated authorization level	−25,502				
Estimated outlays	−25,502				
Total—Functions other than 050:					
Estimated authority/budget authority	−2,034				
Estimated outlays	−25,461				

This bill would raise the authorized size of the Special Defense Acquisition Fund in function 150. The increase would derive from diverting certain receipts from function 050 to function 150. In function 050 they are recorded as offsetting receipts so there is an effect on budget authority and outlays, but they are recorded as a collection in function 150 affecting outlays only. (See Table 3 and 4).

The bill authorizes an average strength of 12,500 for the Coast Guard Reserve; the associated costs fall under budget function 400.

Function 600 records the accrual amounts for the military retirement trust fund and various amounts associated with civil service retirement. The military endstrengths authorized in this bill have a retirement accrual cost of $19.4 billion. The employee and employer contributions to civil service retirement add about $4 billion to function 600.

Finally, receipts in function 950 are affected because this function receives the accrual payments from function 050 associated with military retirement and employer contributions to social security. Function 950 also receives civil service retirement contributions associated with DoD's civilian employees which are also authorized in this bill.

6. Estimated cost to State and local governments: None.
7. Estimate comparison: None.
8. Previous cost estimate: None.
9. Estimate prepared by: Eugene Bryton, Paul Cullinan, Alex G. Manganaris, and Michael McCord.
10. Estimate approved by: James L. Blum, Assistant Director, for Budget Analysis.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON PROCUREMENT, RDT&E, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS SPECIAL FOREGN CURRENCY, AND CIVIL DEFENSE AUTHORIZAITON REQUEST

Fiscal Year	Authorization Request	Senate Authorization	House Authorization	Conference	Appropriated
1964...........	$ 15,358,691	$ 14,951,491	$ 15,856,391	$ 15,314,291	$ 14,364,690
1965...........	17,185,300	17,040,140	16,914,800	16,967,620	16,722,391
1966...........	19,363,050	15,283,800	15,303,400	[1] 19,468,250	[1] 19,320,550
1967...........	20,769,659	17,170,059	17,858,059	[1] 21,404,459	[1] 21,057,559
1968...........	21,066,432	20,765,332	21,481,032	21,168,032	30,149,432
1969...........	22,385,052	21,341,738	21,636,964	21,625,750	18,491,041
1970...........	21,963,660	19,988,886	21,347,860	20,710,502	[2] 19,311,520
1971...........	20,317,430	[3] 19,242,889	20,237,439	[3] 19,929,089	[3] 18,997,376
1972...........	[4 5 7] 22,359,129	[6] 21,016,417	[5] 21,252,682	[6] 21,316,870	20,461,802
1973...........	[8] 23,272,971	20,521,671	21,318,788	[9] 21,588,747	19,567,838
1974[10 12]...........	21,959,100	20,947,563	20,445,255	21,299,520	20,163,250
1975[11]...........	23,130,139	21,819,371	22,642,963	22,195,037	[13] 20,892,540
1976...........	28,562,388	[15] 25,233,535	26,539,023	25,513,383	24,850,879
197T...........	5,863,737	5,271,798	5,474,017	5,354,723	5,193,638
1977...........	[14] 34,218,765	31,831,348	33,256,443	32,522,202	31,626,183
1978...........	[16] 36,258,150	36,329,077	36,484,962	36,573,681	33,771,625
1979...........	[17] 37,486,012	37,339,869	36,557,869	37,255,969	35,461,500
1980...........	40,123,241	40,108,896	41,393,243	41,390,457	40,644,202
1981[18]...........	49,867,194	54,697,386	55,718,266	55,523,246	53,487,013
1982[19]...........	136,491,251	136,536,111	136,111,036	130,969,451	129,403,191
1983...........	183,451,654	177,397,810	177,066,115	177,867,548	169,513,224
1984...........	197,968,162	186,052,235	187,771,900	187,490,599	182,544,079
1985...........	224,496,604	213,542,429	208,053,804	212,982,460	207,553,861
1986...........	230,465,375	214,551,780	206,163,746	215,308,540	213,234,724
1987...........	224,777,065	———	———	———	———

FOOTNOTES

1. Includes supplemental which is not included in House/Senate authorizations since supplemental request was received subsequent to House/Senate action on initial authorization request.
2. Of this amount $350,000,000 to be derived by transfer from stock funds.
3. Included $334,000,000 for Safeguard construction and family housing.
4. Reflects budget amendment submitted subsequent to House action (+$111,000,000).
5. Included $183,600,000 for Safeguard construction and family housing.
6. Included $109,570,000 for Safeguard construction and family housing.
7. Includes $59,762,000 additional requested for civilian pay increases pursuant to Public Law 91-656.
8. Includes $3,000,000 for special foreign currency program for Navy under RDT&E appropriation: includes fiscal year 1973 budget amendments of $54,000,000 for civilian personnel pay raise. $254,800,000 for various programs, and June 27, 1972, amendments of $170,000,000 for Southeast Asia and SALT related items.
9. Includes $644,900,000 additional authorization in sec. 801 of Public Law 92-570.
10. Includes $2,600,000 for special foreign currency program for Navy under RDT&E appropriation.
11. Includes $2,570,000 for special foreign currency program for Navy under RDT&E appropriation.
12. Does not include the February 4, 1974 supplemental authorization request for procurement and RDT&E in the amount of $1,244,589,000.
13. Does not include $700,000 appropriated for military support of South Vietnam.

Footnotes (continued)--

14. Includes authorization amendments ($97,000,000 addition to Air Force missiles for Minuteman, $974,000 addition to Navy shipbuilding and $200,000,000 for Navy RDT&E). These amendments were received subsequent to, and therefore not considered in, House authorization action.
15. Includes $221,000,000 fiscal year 1976 supplemental authorization for repair and modernization of the U.S.S. Belknap guided missile cruiser.
16. Includes the July 13, 1977 supplemental authorization for procurement and RDT&E in the amount of $404,907,000 as well as subsequent congressional action.
17. Includes the February 28, 1979, amended supplemental authorization request for procurement and RDT&E in the amount of $2,002,200,000 as well as subsequent congressional action.
18. Includes the March 11, 1981, supplemental authorization request for procurement, RDT&E in the amount of $2,958,594,000 as well as subsequent congressional action.
19. Does not include supplemental authorisation request for fiscal year 1982 for procurement, RDT&E and operation and maintenance in the amount of $1,451,800,000.

Notes: During fiscal years 1964 and 1965 tracked combat vehicles were not subject to authorization action. During fiscal year 1964, 1965, and 1966 the emergency fund under R&D was not subject to authorization action.
Authorization for other weapons was not required prior to fiscal year 1971.
Authorization for torpedoes and related support equipment was not required prior to fiscal year 1972.
Authorization for civil defense was not required prior to fiscal year 1978.
Authorization for operation and maintenance was not required prior to fiscal year 1982.
Authorization for ammunition and other procurement was not required prior to fiscal year 1983.
Authorization for working capital funds was not required prior to fiscal year 1985.

RELATIONSHIP OF ANNUAL AUTHORIZATION TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

History of Section 138, Title 10, United States Code

(Superseding "Section 412")

The jurisdiction of the committee so far as specific annual authorizations are concerned was increased significantly in 1959 by the enactment of section 412(b) of Public Law 86-149 which required annual congressional authorization of appropriations for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels. That law was amended and expanded as follows:

In 1962 (Public Law 87-436) to require similar authorization of appropriations for research, development, test, or evaluation associated with aircraft missiles, and naval vessels;

In 1963 (Public Law 88-174) to require authorization of appropriations for all research, development, test, or evaluation carried on by the Department of Defense;

In 1965 (Public Law 89-37) to require authorization of appropriations for the procurement of tracked combat vehicles;

In 1967 (Public Law 90-168) to require annual authorization of the personnel strengths of each of the Selected Reserves of the Reserve components as a prior condition for the appropriation of funds for the pay and allowances for the Reserve components;

In 1969 (Public Law 91-121) to require authorization of appropriations for the procurement of other weapons to or for the use of any armed force of the United States. (Essentially, heavy, medium, and light artillery, antiaircraft artillery, rifles, machineguns, mortars, small arms weapons, and any crew-fired piece using fixed ammunition);

In 1970 (Public Law 91-441) to require authorization of appropriations to or for the use of the Navy for the procurement of torpedoes and related support equipment; and to require authorization of the average annual active duty personnel strength for each component of the Armed Forces as a condition precedent to the appropriation of funds for this purpose;

In 1972 (Public Law 92-436) to require annual authorization for the average military training student loads for each component of the Armed Forces, and modified the provisions relating to authorization for active duty personnel strength;

In 1973 (Public Law 93-155) to require authorization for end strength civilian employment for each component of the Defense Department in each fiscal year;

In 1975 (Public Law 94-106) to require the annual authorization of military construction of ammunition facilities;

In 1980 (Public Law 96-342) to require the annual authorization of appropriations of funds for the operation and maintenance of any armed force or the activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1981; and

In 1982 (Public Law 97-86) to require the annual authorization of appropriations of funds for procurement of ammunition or other procurement for any armed force or for agencies of the Department of Defense (other than military departments).

Also, in 1973 these enactments were codified by section 803(a) of Public Law 93-155 into Title 10, United States Code, as section 138. The law today reads as follows:

SEC. 138. ANNUAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS AND PERSONNEL STRENGTHS FOR THE ARMED FORCES; ANNUAL MANPOWER REQUIREMENTS AND OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE REPORTS

(a) No funds may be appropriated for any fiscal year to or for the use of any armed force or obligated or expended for—

(1) procurement of aircraft, missiles, or naval vessels;

(2) any research, development, test, or evaluation, or procurement or production related thereto;

(3) procurement of tracked combat vehicles;

(4) procurement of other weapons;

(5) procurement of naval torpedoes and related support equipment;

(6) military construction (as defined in subsection (f)); or

(7) the operation and maintenance of any armed forces or the activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments);

(8) procurement of ammunition; or

(9) other procurement by any armed force or by the activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments);

unless funds therefor have been specifically authorized by law.

(b)(1) Congress shall authorize the average personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each reserve component of the armed forces. No funds may be appropriated for any fiscal year for the pay and allowances of members on any reserve component of the armed forces. No funds may be appropriated for any fiscal year for the pay and allowances of members on any reserve component of the armed forces unless the personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of that reserve component for that fiscal year has been authorized by law.

(2) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Congress each year, not later than February 15, a written report concerning the equipment of the National Guard and the reserve components of the armed forces for each of the three succeeding fiscal years. Each such report shall include—

(A) recommendations as to the type and quality of each major item of equipment which should be in the inventory of the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve of each reserve component of the armed forces;

(B) the quantity and average age of each type of major item of equipment which is expected to be physically available in the inventory of the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve of each reserve component as of the beginning of each fiscal year covered by the report;

(C) the quantity and cost of each type of major item of equipment which is expected to be procured for the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve and each reserve component from commercial sources or to be transferred to each such Selected Reserve from the active-duty components of the armed forces;

(D) the quantity of each type of major item of equipment which is expected to be retired, decommissioned, transferred, or otherwise removed from the physical inventory of the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve of each reserve component and the plans for replacement of that equipment.

The report required by this paragraph shall be prepared and expressed in the same format and with the same level of detail as the information presented in the annual Five Year Defense Program Procurement Annex prepared by the Department of Defense.

REGULATORY IMPACT

Paragraph 11(b) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate requires that a report on the regulatory impact of a bill be included in the report on such bill. The committee finds that in the case of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1986, there is no regulatory impact.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

Pursuant to the provisions of Rule XXVI, Paragraph 12 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the changes in existing law made by certain portions of the bill have not been shown in this section of the report since, in the opinion of the committee, it is necessary to dispense with showing such changes in existing law separately in the report in order to expedite the business and reduce the expenditure of funds of the Senate.

MINORITY VIEWS OF MESSRS. GOLDWATER, THURMOND, WARNER, HUMPHREY, QUAYLE, EAST, WILSON, DENTON, AND GRAMM, ON THE STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE PROGRAM

We would like to express our opposition to the action taken by the Committee on the President's Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) program. The full Committee rejected the recommendation of the Subcommittee on Strategic and Theater Nuclear Forces to fund the program at $4.05 billion. Instead, the Committee reduced funding for the SDI program in the Departments of Defense and Energy budgets by a total of $1.4 billion from the Administration's request of almost $5.4 billion. The Committee applied $453 million of that reduction to a complementary technology initiative in conventional defenses. Report language was adopted regarding the SDI program and a conventional technology initiative under the notion of a "Balanced Technology Initiative". These actions were taken by the Committee as a result of a series of 10–9 votes. We strongly disagree with both the level of funding for the SDI program and with the associated report language.

We believe that the funding level for the SDI program resulting from this amendment is insufficient to meet the requirements of our national security. In addition, although we support an aggressive program to develop high technology conventional defenses, we do not support the conventional technology initiative as described in the Committee report. We agree that more focus is required in defining objectives and milestones for the SDI program. Finally, we regret that the manner and timing of the introduction of this initiative into the Committee's deliberations inhibited rather than facilitated potential bipartisan cooperation on the concept. We believe that we must, therefore, express our views on the SDI program.

SDI FUNDING LEVEL

In our judgment, a more aggressive SDI program is necessary for several important reasons. The full range of Soviet activities in the area of strategic defense indicate that the Soviet Union may be preparing an ABM defense of its national territory in violation of the 1972 ABM Treaty. As a result of these activities, the Soviet Union is in a position to rapidly break out or "creep out" of the ABM Treaty.

A unilateral widespread deployment of strategic defenses by the Soviet Union would be highly destabilizing. When viewed in the context of the vast counterforce capability of Soviet strategic and theater nuclear forces, such a deployment would further undermine the credibility of the United States strategic deterrent and thus pose a grave threat to our national security and that of our allies. An aggressive SDI program is necessary to provide the United States with deployment options should further Soviet activities to expand its strategic defenses or increase its offensive forces require a response by the United States.

An aggressive SDI program is also necessary because of the role that strategic defenses could play in enhancing the survivability of U.S. strategic forces—an important objective of our strategic force modernization program—and of U.S. and allied conventional forces in various theaters. By denying Soviet warplanners the option of a credible disarming first strike, and in general by significantly reducing the level of confidence they have in their warplans, strategic defenses would provide increased stability in a crisis and thus enhance deterrence.

In that regard, even limited strategic defense deployments could make an important contribution to U.S. national security. As a nation, we should have a balanced force posture including both strategic offensive forces and strategic defenses. While we comply with our current arms control obligations, our arms control policies should be aimed at facilitating a transition to this more balanced force posture. As the Administration's policy rationale for SDI has evolved, there has been an increasing emphasis on this important role for strategic defenses in our deterrent strategy. As we will discuss later, we believe that even greater emphasis needs to be given to this important role for strategic defenses.

Finally, we believe it important to support an aggressive SDI program because of the role that it plays in the United States arms reduction strategy. It is clear that the Soviet desire to halt the SDI program was the decisive factor influencing Moscow's decision to return to the negotiating table in Geneva. The SDI program has supported U.S. arms reduction negotiating efforts in the short term, and by reducing the utility of ballistic missiles it holds the promise of facilitating U.S. efforts to achieve significant and stabilizing offensive arms reduction in the future. In our judgment, reductions of the magnitude contained in the current bill undercut the U.S. negotiating team in Geneva and the important work its members are trying to do.

The SDI Organization (SDIO) has been able to absorb Congressional funding reductions in previous years by making premature down-selections in a variety of technology areas. That has introduced increased technical risk into the program. Large funding reductions this year cannot be accommodated in a similar fashion, because in most cases these premature down-selections have already been made. The SDIO will, therefore, be forced to make decisions between technology development and the validation of that technology through testing. Since we are several years into the SDI program, the portion of the total SDI budget consumed by the technology validation effort has grown naturally as the technology that is being developed requires testing.

According to the SDIO, $4.1 billion will be required in fiscal year 1987 simply to maintain a level of activity consistent with the contractual obligations undertaken in previous years. The funding level provided by the Balanced Technology Initiative is $500 million below that sustaining level. Therefore, it threatens to delay the planned early 1990s decision, and thus delay the availability of options to move toward a more stable and effective basis for deterrence through the introduction of strategic defenses.

SDI PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

We do believe that the goals and objectives of the SDI program need to be more clearly defined by the Administration. Perhaps more important, however, we believe that they need to be more focused on performing specific military missions. We continue to support the President's long term goal of highly effective strategic defenses that would offer comprehensive protection of the United States and the American people. The feasibility of such defenses remains to be demonstrated, and an important objective of the SDI program should be to determine it.

There are, however, more limited objectives that strategic defenses can meet prior to demonstrating the feasibility of comprehensive population defense. The SDI program should be identifying promising initial deployment options that are designed to erode the confidence of Soviet leaders in their warplans. In this way, strategic defenses could address urgent military requirements that the United States faces in the near-term. For example, early applications of strategic defense technology could be used to enhance the survivability of our space systems, which are vital in deterring both conventional and nuclear conflict.

The principal targets of Soviet strategic offensive forces are: U.S. strategic forces; their supporting command, control, and communications systems; leadership; other military forces; and war-supporting industry. The ultimate objective of the SDI program is to destroy ballistic missiles before they reach their targets, whatever those targets may be. Initial strategic defense deployments could be used preferentially to defend those and other targets, and in so doing introduce a significant degree of uncertainty in the minds of Soviet warplanners. By demonstrating to the Soviets that they cannot with confidence achieve their objectives in using nuclear weapons, strategic defenses of even limited effectiveness would significantly enhance deterrence.

The Armed Services Committee has stated in the past that it believes that inadequate emphasis is being given within the SDI program to the development of initial deployment options. We continue to be concerned that the SDI Organization has institutionalized a response to the President's challenge that is biased against the development of intermediate options. Our recognition of the potential contribution of initial strategic defense deployments does not indicate a lack of support for the SDI program's long-term objectives. Rather, it is a recognition that an evolutionary approach to the President's vision could provide positive benefits to our national security in the near-term.

Another area that has received less attention than it deserves is the application of strategic defense technologies to the problem of theater defenses. Because the Committee believes that the threat to our allies posed by Soviet tactical ballistic missiles has received inadequate emphasis, this year we have initiated the development of an anti-tactical ballistic missile system for deployment. This is a good example of how the SDI program can make a positive contribution to our national security and that of our allies in the near-term.

The budget environment we face today is very different from the one that existed at the time of the President's March 23, 1983, speech. The need to limit overall federal spending has created significant constraints on the defense budget. In this environment, the SDI program must address today's real military requirements if it is going to compete successfully for scarce resources.

ENHANCED CONVENTIONAL DEFENSE

There is no disagreement among members of the Committee on the need for a significant research and development effort to enhance our conventional capabilities. In view of significant Soviet numerical advantages in conventional forces, an advantage that we are unlikely over to match, we need the force multiplier effects that innovative concepts like smart weapons can provide. In addition, as strategic defenses reduce the military utility of ballistic missiles, it will be incumbent on our conventional forces to take on a greater share of the burden in meeting our extended deterrent commitments. We therefore view strategic defenses and enhanced high-technology conventional forces as complimentary.

We do take issue, however, with the approach to enhancing our conventional capability that is outlined in the Balanced Technology Initiative. That approach seems to seek a solution to a problem simply by throwing money at it. It invites the same criticism that is often heard regarding the rapid growth in funding for the Strategic Defense Initiative program. The notion of throwing money at a problem, without clearly defining the goals and objectives of the research, is just as wrong in the area of conventional defense as it would be in any other area of defense investment.

More important, in the context of the overall recommendations of the Committee for funding for research and development, the Balanced Technology Initiative amounts to little more than a technology "shell game". Under the pressure of budgetary constraints, the Committee recommended undistributed reductions totalling over $2.0 billion to research and development accounts. A significant portion of this reduction will of necessity be applied to ongoing technology base, advanced technology, and defense-wide support activities that the Committee has supported in the past. Many of those programs directly address the conventional shortfalls that are the target of the proposed initiative. It makes little sense to us to significantly reduce ongoing programs supported by valid requirements and budget requests, while reallocating resources to new programs in amounts that will be difficult to obligate in the initial year. Such an approach can hardly be viewed as an "enhancement" of our conventional defense technology base.

There are practical problems in the implementation of the Balanced Technology Initiative as well. For example, the allocation of a single dollar of Balanced Technology Initiative funding protects the recipient program from undistributed reductions. In view of the magnitude of the undistributed reductions contained in the Committee's recommendations, one can imagine the bureaucratic chaos that is likely to occur in the scramble by program managers to seek immunity from undistributed reductions by securing a claim to Balanced Technology Initiative resources. In addition, the language of the initiative stipulates that no funding can be applied to any project or activity that supports the SDI program. As a consequence, a defense agency project that is conducting the vast majority of its work on a vital conventional defense program, but the receives a very small portion of funding for activities to support the SDI program, will be prohibited from benefitting from Balanced Technology Initiative funding.

In addition, the Balanced Technology Initiative approach ignores the activities within the SDI program that have an important and direct application to conventional defense. The distinction drawn in the initiative between technologies and weapons systems that are applicable to nuclear rather than conventional conflict is not as clear as it once was. The sensor activities within the SDI program will make an important contribution to high-technology conventional defense. The space system survivability activities within the SDI program will help to ensure that our strategic and conventional command, control, and communications systems are survivable and therefore effective. In addition, certain weapons systems being developed under SDI may in the end have a more important application to conventional than to strategic defense. For example, railgun technology has great promise for ship defense and anti-armor applications, two areas that are stressed in the Balanced Technology Initiative. It is therefore likely that significant reductions in the SDI program will slow the development of systems that have both conventional and strategic defense applications.

BARRY GOLDWATER,
Chairman.
STROM THURMOND.
JOHN W. WARNER.
GORDON J. HUMPHREY.
DAN QUAYLE.
JOHN P. EAST.
PETE WILSON.
JEREMIAH DENTON.
PHIL GRAMM.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. COHEN

STRATEGIC MODERNIZATION

The Scowcroft Commission called for the prompt deployment of the MX in existing Minuteman silos, the expeditious development of the Small ICBM (with full-scale development beginning in FY-1987), and the restructuring of the U.S. approach to arms control so as to promote a shift from large, highly MIRVed ICBMs to small, single-warhead ones. Similarly, the longstanding position of the Committee, which I have supported, has been to favor survivable ICBM basing over deployment of ICBMs in vulnerable basing modes.

Consistent with this, I support the Committee's reaffirmation of the current law, endorsed by the President, which prohibits the deployment of more than 50 MX in existing Minuteman silos. At the same time, I strongly oppose the Committee's decision to reduce funding for the Small ICBM program by $700 million, about half the requested level. If it were to be enacted, this reduction would have a severely disruptive effect on what the Committee acknowledges has been a model advanced development program. According to the Air Force, "A reduction of FY-87 funding by $700 million would result in contractor layoffs from pre-FSD levels and would not permit establishment of a minimum subcontractor base to support integrated weapon system design efforts. An eighteen-month IOC slip would result. Another critical impact of scaling back the early FSD program would be the loss of many key personnel with vital pre-FSD experience."

Last year, the Committee directed that an independent review of the Small ICBM program be conducted by the Defense Science Board (DSB). As indicated in the Committee's report, this review concluded that the Small ICBM deployed in Hardened Mobile Launchers would not only be highly survivable against current Soviet threats, but would "remain highly survivable in the face of future Soviet developments and countermeasures". Accordingly, the DSB review concluded that it would be in the interests of the U.S. to deploy the Small ICBM in Hardened Mobile Launchers, and recommended that full scale engineering development begin in fiscal year 1987, as proposed by the Scowcroft Commission and the Administration. Ironically, the Committee's action is contrary to and, were it enacted, would undercut the recommendations of the DSB review conducted at the Committee's request.

In his May 27 statement on U.S. Interim Restraint Policy, the President called upon the Congress to restore bipartisan support for a program to restore the survivability and effectiveness of the U.S. ICBM program. A vigorous Small ICBM program is essential to this effort. For the first time in a decade, a consensus spanning the political spectrum—from the Heritage Foundation to the Union of Concerned Scientists—has emerged in support of a U.S. ICBM program. In contrast to the divisiveness which has paralyzed ICBM modernization in recent years, the Small ICBM program offers the opportunity for bipartisan consensus on this critical issue and for responding to the Soviet threat and arms control violations.

Accordingly, in my view, the Committee's action on the Small ICBM, based on an arbitrary priority criterion of favoring systems to be deployed prior to 1990 at the expense of those to be deployed later, is short-sighted.

William S. Cohen.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. HART

I voted to report the FY87 Defense Authorization Act to the floor of the Senate because I believe it contains important provisions—especially in the strategic nuclear area—which are in our security interests. At the same time, I take strong exception to a number of the measures adopted by the Committee, especially with respect to the funds authorized in key nuclear and naval programs.

The Committee's decision to authorize in excess of $301 billion for national defense is unfortunately at odds with the reality of the nation's severe budgetary constraints. Authorizing such a level not only reflects inattention to the imperative of fiscal austerity, but also ensures that the Committee mark will be ignored in determining the final defense budget. At a time when the Committee has exercised great leadership in recommending reforms for the Department of Defense, the Committee should reform its own practices and cease abdicating its authority over the defense budget by setting unrealistic spending levels which will only be abrogated in subsequent deliberations.

Beyond this general reservation, I have a number of observations about recommendations contained in the bill. They include:

STRATEGIC MODERNIZATION

A key weakness in the report is the approach endorsed by the Committee to modernize the land-based leg of the strategic nuclear triad. Reducing funding for the single-warhead mobile missile (SICBM)—while sustaining funding the M-X missile in fixed silos—only guarantees continued vulnerability and instability in our land-based forces. Sacrificing the one potential solution to land-based missile vulnerability, by cutting funds for the "Midgetman," the Committee decision clearly contravenes the recommendations of the Scowcroft Commission and the Administration's stated objectives of redressing our strategic vulnerability. I voted in favor of restoring funds for the SICBM, but the motion did not carry.

In recognition of last year's Congressionally imposed limitation on the deployment of M-X missiles, the Committee accepted my proposed report language reaffirming the cap limiting the number of M-X missiles placed in fixed silos to fifty. In light of recent statements by Administration officials of their apparent intent to violate this limit at some point in the future, I was encouraged that the Committee agreed to add language unequivocally restating the will of the Congress.

STRATEGIC DEFENSES

I supported the Committee's decision to adopt the Nunn-Cohen initiative for a Balanced Technology Concept to guide our overall defense research and development objectives. Although I believe the funds authorized for the Strategic Defense Initiative under this concept are still far in excess of what is required for a vigorous research program, it is encouraging that the Committee recognizes the critical need to redirect funds towards our most fundamental defense weakness—the absence of a strong conventional deterrent.

The continued contradictions in the Administration's presentation of SDI program objectives and its failure to identify an overall "systems architecture" still suggest a program in search of coherence. After three years, the Administration continues variously to define the initiative as a research program, a deployment program, a lever for arms control, a move to total population defenses or simply a means of defending our existing offensive strategic forces. I believe the American people deserve far better from their government before they are asked to dedicate billions of their tax dollars on behalf of this quixotic venture.

Finally, the Administration's "new" interpretation of the anti-ballistic missile (ABM) Treaty revealed earlier this year suggests that the most fundamental aspects of a treaty which had guided our defense planning since 1972 are somehow no longer legally binding. The Administration is in effect asking the Senate to accede to a new treaty formulation which contravenes the substance and guidelines of the treaty ratified by the Senate in 1972. The Senate is simultaneously being denied access to the elements of the negotiating record which led the Administration to its current interpretration. *This is an unprecedented violation of Constitutional authority and an issue which must be debated by the full Senate when this Bill comes to the Floor.*

STRATEGIC ARMS CONTROL

The Committee adopted a Sense of the Senate amendment I offered regarding SALT II. The amendment states it is in the national security interest of the United States to abide by the numerical subceilings on strategic forces under SALT II, as long as the Soviet do the same. This is the first affirmative vote cast in the Senate on behalf of SALT II since the President's announcement on May 27 of his intention to exceed SALT restraints later this year. It is my expectation that this amendment will lead to broader endorsement of US adherence to SALT II by the full Senate. A companion amendment proposed by Senator Quayle and supported fully by the Committee, states that such actions do not constitute any intention to unilaterally abide by agreements which the Soviets have clearly violated, as consistent with international law.

In addition, the Committee supported an amendment to protect from cuts all programs under the Department of Energy dedicated to verification and control technologies. Given the high priority the Administration has accorded to verification and compliance issues, the need for continued funding of these programs—a modest portion of overall DOE spending—is imperative.

SEAPOWER

The most disappointing result of the Committee actions appear in the Navy accounts. As reported, the bill provides the first procurement funding for the new SSN-21 class attack submarine—a submarine that will weaken, not strengthen, our fleet. At a price of at least one billion dollars each, the SSN-21 will ensure that our submarine force, already outnumbered three to one by the Soviets, will grow still smaller. It is also a poorly designed submarine. The grossly oversized SSN-21 will be a clearly vulnerable target for the non-acoustic detection systems of the next century.

The United States needs innovative nuclear submarine designs, and we need to increase the size of the submarine by buying some non-nuclear submarines as complements for the nucler boats. However, the Navy—and the Committee—has no interest in these efforts.

In addition, by authorizing funds for Aegis ships—cruisers and the new DDG-51 class destroyers—the Committee is implicitly helping to perpetuate the Navy's obsolete force structure, a structure built around a few large aircraft carriers nominally protected by escort ships. The DDG-51, lacking its own helicopters, can do little against submarines.

OTHER CONVENTIONAL FORCES

Two systems pose particular concern during a time of severe budget constraints: the C-17 and the Bradley fighting vehicle. The cost of the C-17—over $200 million per copy—does not buy commensurate security. Its greatest failing is the high cost of the system relative to its obvious vulnerability in combat.

The Bradley fighting vehicle program has been problematic from the outset. At a minimum, Bradley vehicles needs major fixes, including strapping on additional armor, removing the ammunition storage from the crew compartment, and reconfiguring the turret so troops can be safer from mine attack.

Overall, this bill, with a few exceptions, tends to perpetuate business as usual, with the Committee making only limited changes in the budget submitted by the President—by and large refusing to make the difficult choices needed to strengthen our defense and articulate clear objectives to the American public for the future of out security.

During consideration of the authorization on the Senate floor, I will be working with my colleagues—both on and off the Committee—to ensure we do better by the American people.

Gary Hart.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. EXON

Last year, in my additional thoughts on the Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1986, I expressed my concern that the Administration, the Defense Department, and the Congress would have to do a much better job of determining real defense priorities within realistic budget constraints. It is unfortunate that none of these bodies has fully done so.

The President has refused to acknowledge that even our necessary defense modernization effort will have to be cut back in order to deal with our ruinous national debt. The Defense Department submitted its request but has refused to assist the Congress in identifying priorities when it was clear that some reductions would have to be made.

The Congress is also a culprit in not maximizing our defense dollars. While highly critical of the Defense Department for not recognizing the present budget crunch, Members of the Congress are also scrambling about to make sure that the weapon built in their State or district is funded, even if there is no pressing military need for it. Not only are base closings still politically difficult, but new naval bases are authorized in this bill. Given the size and changing capabilities of the Soviet Navy, a few additional homeports to further disperse the fleet may be prudent. But one can only wonder at a plan that calls for not one or two new ports on the Gulf coast but rather nine ports, some of them for only four ships! We do not even have that many homeports on each of our open ocean coasts. By going ahead with these politically attractive programs, real needs such as serious munitions shortfalls and maintenance backlogs, remain shortfunded.

This tendency to place domestic political concerns ahead of overall national security interests is real waste in defense spending. While the $400 hammers and $600 washers we have heard so much about were largely the result of negligence and uninterest, the fact that, once again, the Congress has placed domestic political considerations ahead of legitimate, top priority national security concerns is evidence that we are not acting responsibly in this climate of budget constraints.

In an effort to discourage this during the Committee markup of this bill, the Committee Chairman adopted a rule I offered which prohibited add-ons for items and programs not requested by the Defense Department. In addition, to prohibiting add-ons, increases to requested items were only permitted if the Committee could identify specific, lower priority offsets. This proposal was not intended to defend the budget presented by the Defense Department or the relative priorities within it. Anyone who has ever participated in the shaping of a defense budget knows that all Administrations play politics with that budget. But it was a first step in establishing greater self-discipline and was also intended to send a message to the Defense Department that the Senate was going to take its budget recommendations at face value.

Chairman Goldwater should be applauded for his efforts in this regard. His decision to enact this rule was a step in the right direction and the logical follow-on to the efficiency sought by his Defense Department reorganization changes earlier this year. It is most unfortunate that the Committee membership did not have the discipline to enforce this rule and, once again, hundreds of millions were authorized for militarily questionable and low priority programs. On their individual merits, many of these programs should be funded but only in an era of less restrictive spending.

Nonetheless, under the leadership of Senators Goldwater and Nunn, the Senate Armed Services Committee has done much in this past year to ensure that our defense dollars are maximized. Our hearings this year were intended to focus on matters of military strategy and operations so that priorities could be better identified within the budget request. This is a sound approach and one I encourage the Committee to continue.

I was also pleased that the Committee has begun to approach SDI from a more realistic perspective, shaping a meaningful program that can positively influence arms control and provide a near term capability to counter Soviet movement away from the ABM Treaty. Indeed, this is the one area in which the Committee identified real priorities by noting that SDI was "breaking the bank", seriously reducing our conventional research and development efforts, and thereby hurting our efforts to counter the massive conventional buildup of the Soviet armed forces. Clearly, a more balanced research program into future technologies is needed to maintain an overall sound balance of power between ourselves and the Soviets, in the areas of both nuclear and conventional weapons. Research into strategic defense is absolutely essential and I strongly support it. However, it should not be oversold as our only hope for future peace and stability.

This year was a serious test of our resolve to deal with the deficit. The Armed Services Committee attempted to do so but still fell short of what I would like to have seen. Both the deficit and the Soviet military buildup pose very real threats to our nation's security, and our defense policy and budget must address both threats. It is evident that the Committee will have to re-visit its authorization funding level of $301 billion.

J. JAMES EXON.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. LEVIN

While I voted to report the Committee's version of the Fiscal Year 1987 Defense Authorization Act to the full Senate, I do not feel that we have exercised as fully as we might the prudent judgment expected of us in our decisions on certain programs and policies of importance to our nation's security.

In these times of severe fiscal constraint we should be sure that every dollar authorized for defense is a dollar that will give us a full return on our investment. We have failed to do so. We also have neglected to satisfactorily address a number of important policy issues on matters for which the Committee has oversight responsibility.

The nation's plans for our strategic forces are in disarray—from ASAT, to SDI, to the small ICBM. We do not know how these programs relate to each other nor do we understand how they relate to the Administration's efforts at arms control. After three years and billions of dollars in research we still know little more now of the feasibility of the Strategic Defense Initiative than we did at the outset. We don't know whether it is to defend us all or just our strategic forces. We don't know how much it might cost, in whole or in part; whether it might cost 250 billion or 2 trillion dollars. We don't know what might work and what won't work among the many projects of the SDI. Despite our not knowing any of the answers to these important questions, we still voted to authorize nearly a billion dollars more for SDI research than we did last year. Prudence suggests that we should have held SDI research to current levels until these questions are answered.

The Committee has failed to address in a forthright fashion the chronic problem of inefficient levels of production. Unlike previous years, the Committee is recommending significant production stretchouts for a number of major systems. When the subcommittees brought forward their recommendations to the full Committee, stretchouts were proposed in six major systems. Stretchouts are almost always undesirable. In these cases they are especially undesirable because of the low level of production efficiency which we are currently experiencing in the majority of the weapons systems presently in procurement.

At the same time that we have directed these stretchouts, we have recommended full funding for six major new starts. The juxtaposition of major new starts with stretchouts of other major weapons systems highlights a serious and continuing problem with defense acquisition. Simply stated, we start more programs than we can afford to efficiently pay for over the life of the programs. Though we identified sufficient funds to restore a number of programs, we still have not addressed the fundamental problem. It is a problem we must come to terms with.

Another responsibility that we have neglected is consideration of the need to reduce outlays by the Department of Defense in FY 1987. The Senate Budget Resolution requires a reduction in outlays from approximately $296.7 billion to $282 billion. We did not achieve this target. We have reduced outlays by only approximately $9.6 billion which leaves us short by approximately $5 billion. Reducing outlays is difficult and complex, but it must be done if we are going to achieve our deficit reduction goals. Our failure to realize the total reduction in outlays will complicate the conference with the House on the authorization bill. To the extent that we fail to address the problem of outlay reduction in the authorization process, we will have abdicated our responsibility and authority to establish priorities to the Appropriations Committee.

LABOR AND CONTRACTING PROVISIONS

I opposed the package of amendments offered by Senator Gramm for a number of reasons. First, I opposed the manner in which the committee considered these amendments. They were first offered and approved by the Preparedness Subcommittee which does not have jurisdiction over all, if any, of the amendments. Secondly, many of the amendments addressed government-wide issues or issues which were clearly beyond the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee.

Moreover, each of these amendments was complicated and each warranted more careful consideration than was provided. None of these amendments was the subject of any Armed Services Committee hearings.

Five of Senator Gramm's amendments affected small and minority businesses and small procurements and were of great interest and concern to the Small Business Committee on which I serve. Four of those five amendments would not have even been referrred to the Armed Services committee if they had been free-standing bills according to the Senate Parliamentarian. The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Small Business Committee, Senators Weicker and Bumpers, outlined their concerns about these amendments in a letter to the Armed Services Committee which correctly pointed out that: "All appearances would indicate that these provisions have not received careful review."

In addition, one of the amendments concerning small procurements in DoD was already part of another bill which would apply government-wide. Senator Cohen and I had been working on this bill for months. It was pending in the Governmental Affairs Committee at the time of the Armed Services mark-up and it has since been approved by that Committee. A provision such as this which was under active consideration by another Committee and which would appropriately be applied on a government-wide basis should not have been hurriedly considered for just the Department of Defense.

Ultimately, Senator Gramm withdrew seven of his amendments from consideration and an amendment I offered to strike another one was approved by a vote of 10 to 9.

Of the remaining six amendments, I feel strongly that issues such as the Service Contract Act or the contracting out policy of the Department of Defense are important and warrant more than the cursory review they received during mark-up. These issues should have been carefully considered by the appropriate Armed Services subcommittee and should have been taken into consideration the concerns of other Committees. The procedure followed on Senator Gramm's amendments was extremely unsound. It leads to resentment by other Committees, possible floor fights, and all but ensures a contentious conference committee meeting with the House.

STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE INSTITUTE

The Defense Department's plan to create a new Federally Funded Research and Development Center (FFRDC), to be known as the SDI Institute, raises serious questions. The hallmarks of an FFRDC—independence and objectivity—are conspicuously absent from DoD's plans.

FFRDCs

Federally-funded research and development centers are private, nonprofit organizations which enjoy a special relationship with the federal government. Each one has an official agency sponsor, such as DoD, which provides at least 70% of their funding and permits them unusual access to agency data and plans. Their sponsor assigns them work on a sole-source basis, meaning FFRDCs do not have to compete for projects with other research facilities. The staff of the FFRDCs are well-paid for their work and receive salaries competitive with the private sector. In exchange for its privileges, an FFRDC is supposed to be a conflict-free organization which provides objective scientific advice to the government. Examples include the Rand Corporation and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.

It is difficult for an FFRDC which is tightly tied to its sponsoring agency to maintain its independence, but that delicate balance must be kept. Executive branch rules, for example, require sponsors to encourage their FFRDCs' independence. (See OFPP Policy Letter 84-1(6)(c).) The purpose is to enable an FFRDC to deliver objective advice—even advice which may be unpopular with its sponsor. Thus, traditionally, FFRDCs are self-managed (usually by an existing, prestigious organization such as a university), are self-operated and conduct self-initiated research.

Independence and objectivity

In its plans to set up an FFRDC devoted solely to the SDI Program, DoD has shown little regard for the Institute's independence or objectivity. For example, DoD plans to approve not only the Institute's chief executive, but also a dozen of its research directors. The Congressional Research Service has stated that this plan "does not conform to past DoD FFRDC personnel practices . . . /and/ may be unprecedented." (Report dated May 8, 1986 at 2.) In another report, CRS warned that this "greater than normal personnel input . . . may not be in the best interests of SDIO for two reasons: 1) its perceived introduction of bias and control over research results, and 2) its potential for merely shifting SDIO personnel into positions of higher salary without concomitant increases in responsibilities." (Report dated May 30, 1986, at 22.)

DoD also plans to shape the Institute's organization to mirror that of SDIO to require the Institute to submit six-month work plans, and to give SDIO authority to approve or reject any aspect of the Institute's proposals. These plans go beyond the usual control's sponsoring agencies exert over their FFRDCs. DoD has also refused to set aside any part of the Institute's budget for self-initiated research. Other FFRDCs have had as much as 24% of their budget freed for this purpose.

Further, DoD has rejected suggestions that it issue a general Request for Proposals to run the Institute and submit any such proposals received to outside experts for review. DoD instead has apparently invited particular individuals to submit a single management proposal. DoD has refused to identify these persons, who are rumored to be closely associated with SDIO, and it refuses to submit their proposal to peer review. This secrecy is troubling not only because Congress has a right to the information but also because of the cloud it casts on the Institute's independence.

Purpose and feasibility

Other basic questions about the FFRDC also demand answers. For example, confusion has arisen over the mission of the SDI Institute. The Conference Report says that the Committee supports the creation of a systems integration FFRDC like the Aerospace Corporation, but not a study and analysis FFRDC. My staff was told in April that the Institute would be primarily a study and analysis center like the Institute for Defense Analysis or the Center for Naval Analysis. If DoD is willing to change the type of FFRDC it creates to meet the Committee's objections, one must ask how carefully DoD has thought out the purpose of the Institute and what other changes it can and should make.

In a study prepared for Senators Simon and Proxmire, CRS has questioned the feasibility of DoD's plan to use a single research facility to evaluate all aspects of SDI research. SDIO tried that task itself and ended up contracting out much of the work to existing FFRDCs and private firms. Now it wants the SDI Institute to perform this evaluation, but CRS questions whether any one entity can gather all the experts necessary. The SDI Institute may become a second tier SDIO, subcontracting out its research needs to still other entities. DoD would then be supporting two Star Wars bureaucracies instead of just one.

Still another basic problem concerns the relationship between the SDI Institute and the SDIO. If the SDI Institute offers similar work to the SDIO but at higher salaries, the best persons in SDIO may transfer to the Institute. An SDIO official has admitted that this "brain drain" is a possibility. If it occurs, the SDI Institute, a private entity, could end up running the program instead of the SDIO. A CRS study recognizes this problem and warns that SDIO may lose even the expertise necessary to monitor the Institute's research. (Report date May 30, 1986 at 20-21.)

Congress' role

In light of the confusion over the program and the signs that the Institute will not be an objective, independent entity, some Senators have demanded that the Institute be stopped. The Committee has adopted an amendment to delay the Institute until there has been a review of the issues.

But the Committee has stopped short of ensuring that DoD will not proceed with the Institute before the questions about if are resolved. The Committee language states simply that, before any funds can be spent on the Institute, DoD must submit a report to Congress and wait 30 legislative days. The DoD report requirements are so vague as to be of little practical value in getting the information Congress needs. More importantly, once the 30 legislative days have elapsed, DoD can go ahead with the Institute, even if that report and another by the GAO demonstrate serious flaws in the program and even if Congress goes out of session on the 31st day.

DoD has refused to supply crucial information to Congress and has rebuffed reasonable suggestions to protect the proposed Institute's independence and objectivity. In such a case, Congress must take an active role.

In short, Congress should block any expenditures on the project until it has had a chance to review the need, cost and plans for the Institute and it has specifically authorized its operation. A pause for Congressional input will not disrupt the SDI Program, since SDIO can continue to obtain the research it needs from its own staff or from the existing research facilities it is currently utilizing.

ALTERNATIVE PERSONNEL SYSTEMS

I am opposed to the provision in the authorization bill, in the form it is written, which would provide authority to the Secretary of Defense to establish an alternative personnel system for scientists, engineers, acquisition personnel and people working in organizations performing scientific, engineering, or acquisition missions.

I oppose the establishment, as it is drafted, of a separate personnel system within DoD for several reasons. As a member of the Senate Civil Service Subcommittee, I am very much aware of concerns that the establishment of separate personnel systems within different agencies may fragment the civil service system and lead to competition among agencies for certain skills and personnel. I am also concerned about occupations other than scientists and engineers within DoD which are left unaddressed by this proposal.

Another area of concern is that this proposal does not mandate whether the personnel system should be established on an organizational or an occupational basis, but rather leaves this to the discretion of the Secretary of Defense. The National Academy of Public Administration and other personnel experts, including DoD's Director of Personnel Management, have recommended that any new personnel systems be established on an organizational basis. I would concur that the evidence shows an organizational-based system is a better approach, and therefore believe that the

Secretary of Defense should be required to include at least some personnel under an organizational system.

In addition, there should be a limit on the number of personnel to be covered under this DoD system. Alternate personnel systems have become the subject of increasing attention lately. The Office of Personnel Management is proposing to revise the entire civil service system. Given the extensive consideration this issue is likely to receive in the near future, it is not appropriate to allow the Secretary of Defense to include up to several hundred thousand people under a new system which may be superseded by another system within a few years. If Congress proceeds with authorizing a new personnel system within DoD, there should at least be a cap on the number of people included.

Finally, because the Civil Service Subcommittee has responsibility for any system-wide revisions of the civil service system, I will support any effort by the Chairman of that Subcommittee, Senator Stevens, to seek a sequential referral of the alternative personnel system section of this bill.

OTHER PROVISIONS

Turning to the positive elements of the bill, I am pleased the Committee made a major effort to protect the operations and maintenance accounts and that element of the procurement accounts dealing with ammunition and spare parts. These are the readiness accounts and the funding levels here directly impact on the combat readiness of our forces. These forces are currently operating at inadequate funding levels and it is essential that we maintain a funding floor to sustain these activities. I am pleased that my amendment to apply an additional $100 million to the purchase of ammunition was accepted.

I am also pleased that the Committee accepted a number of modifications and additions to the bill which are important and should not be overlooked.

Several amendments to the acquisition process and one in the organization of the new office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition promise to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the way we do business in defense. The Committee accepted my amendment that establishes a preference for the acquisition of "nondevelopmental items." As the name implies nondevelopmental items do not require additional development costs; they are already available in the market place or in government inventories. This concept has been strongly supported by the Packard Commission.

Another amendment specifies that the Secretary of Defense will be provided with unedited copies of major test and evaluation reports at the same time that the reports are provided to the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition. The Committee also agreed to establish in law a deputy for the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition. This position will assure the Under Secretary the necessary assistance to control the many organizations and activities under his command.

Lastly, an amendment that overturns the Rogerson Aircraft ASBCA (Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals) decision was accepted. The issues involved are technical, but the ASBCA decision, if allowed to stand, would severely weaken the Truth in Negotiations Act.

A number of other of my amendments were also accepted by the Committee, which I briefly note here.

First, to insure that all credible, time-sensitive intelligence on terrorist activities is given special handling, the Committee directed the Secretary of Defense to route such intelligence to the responsible authorities through the most expeditious and appropriate communications channels.

Second, the Director of the Strategic Defense Initiative Organization has been directed to continue to include a separate report on the activities of his countermeasures office in his annual report to the Congress. He has also been directed to guard the independence and objectivity of the countermeasures office within his organization.

Third, the Committee has also directed the Secretary of Defense to report to the Congress the reasons why there are no fixed fortifications in West Germany to assist in the defense against a Soviet attack. If we and the Germans are serious about the defense of West Germany, then this issue must be addressed.

CARL LEVIN.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. KENNEDY

I want to express my deep personal gratitude to our distinguished chairman, Senator Barry Goldwater, for the leadership he has provided to all of us on the Committee, to the Congress and to the nation. We are all mindful of the fact that this is the last Defense Authorization Bill over which Senator Goldwater will preside, and those of us who have studied the issues and problems of our national defense during Senator Goldwater's tenure will miss him greatly; especially his patience, his guidance and his knowledge.

The Chairman has experienced a year of extraordinary achievement. Not only has he kept the members of this committee working together at a time of sharp debate and division over the nature and scope of our nation's defenses, but he has presided over landmark legislation. The Barry Goldwater DoD Reorganization Act of 1986 will stand as a lasting tribute to his wise, thoughtful and courageous leadership of this committee and of the entire Senate.

I have voted to report the Committee's version of the FY 1987 Defense Authorization Bill to the Senate because I feel that, on balance, it represents a thoughtful and sound approach to our defense priorities. I do, however, have serious reservations about certain parts of the bill.

First, I believe the Committee erred in refusing to mark up the bill to the level of $292 billion in budget authority approved by the Conference Committee, instead of the level of $301 billion. The effect may be to remove the committee from deciding how to achieve the additional required cuts. The Conference mark of $292 billion is more than adequate to meet our defense needs—if we allocate funds wisely and make the right decisions to reduce or eliminate unnecessary or flawed programs.

STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE

In the area of strategic defense, I support the concept of a balanced technology initiative adopted by the Committee. In essence, this concept would transfer funds from SDI to other neglected areas of advanced conventional weapons R&D. This worthwhile effort reflects the Committee's concern that excessive funding levels for SDI are having a severe impact on research and development into ways to improve our conventional defense posture.

I believe, however, that the $3.95 billion amount approved in committee for DoD and DoE research on SDI is excessive; the Committee rejected my motion to freeze the SDI budget at its current level of $3 billion. Funding for SDI has been increasing at an unacceptable rate. Moreover, a greater and greater percentage of these expenditures is now being allocated to questionable tests and demonstrations, including many in areas of technology (such as chemical lasers and hypervelocity railguns) that have been down selected. This is being done not only at the expense of advanced conventional weapons R&D, but also of more promising but less advanced areas of strategic defense research.

In addition, I continue to be concerned about the Administration's efforts to evade the ABM Treaty's limits on the development and testing of certain types of ABM systems and components through its "reinterpretation" of the Treaty's provisions. I will continue to seek ways to prevent the Administration from spending money on SDI tests and demonstrations that are not within the strict—and the only correct—interpretation of the ABM Treaty.

I strongly support the thrust of the Committee's report language on SDI; this language is an important message to the President and to the American people that SDI is moving in too many directions without coherency.

The committee's report reaches a number of important conclusions about the future course of SDI. First, it recommends that the program be geared more toward hedging against the possibility of a Soviet "breakout" from the ABM Treaty. Secondly, the report notes the many technical challenges the program faces; comprehensive defense of populations is, at best, far off in the future, and the SDI program should examine more limited applications for strategic defense. While I agree with the Committee's appraisal of the dubious long-term feasibility of population defense, I also believe that an objective analysis of more limited options—such as the defense of our strategic nuclear forces—will find such options to be wanting as well.

Most important, the Committee has recognized that it is unnecessary to fund the President's full request for SDI in order to maintain our negotiating leverage in Geneva. While the degree if any, of such leverage is debatable, the Committee correctly notes that whatever leverage exists is waning, and that we should be willing to limit the scope of SDI in exchange for "significant, stabilizing and verifiable reductions in strategic offensive forces."

In addition, in the area of SDI, I am opposed to the Committee's decision to make the SDIO Director a four star general. This would appear to be an exercise in political symbolism that was adopted without considering adequately the full implications of adding another four star general.

STRATEGIC ARMS CONTROL

The Committee also adopted an amendment, which I strongly supported, urging the President to continue to abide by the central numerical sublimits of existing strategic arms agreements. The Administration's recent announcement that it intends to repudiate the SALT agreements is one of the worst decisions of the Reagan presidency and it is strongly opposed by the Congress, our allies and the American people.

The SALT limits are far from perfect, but they represent the only existing restraints on the Soviet nuclear build-up. Ironically, the President is discarding SALT just when it will begin to bind the Russians most. To stay within the SALT limits between now and the end of 1987, the Soviet Union will have to dismantle over 300 missiles and bombers, while the U.S. will have to dismantle less than 30. To stay within the limits through 1990, the Soviets will have to dismantle over 600 missiles and five additional submarines, many from among their newest systems. Abandoning SALT now will take the lid off the arms race just when we appear, finally, to be making some progress at the Nuclear and Space Talks in Geneva.

OTHER STRATEGIC FORCE MODERNIZATION

I oppose the Committee's funding of the Administration's request for the development and procurement of the MHV ASAT system and removal of any restrictions on ASAT testing. An objective analysis of this program in the context of overall U.S. national security interests makes clear that there is no justification for its continuation. This is particularly true in light of the criticisms of the program contained in the recent GAO Report. In addition, the Air Force has severely cut back and restructured the ASAT program due to its technical problems and cost increases.

I will work on the Senate floor to delete funds for the further development and production of the MHV ASAT weapon. I will also seek to preserve existing testing restrictions imposed by the Congress in the hope of persuading the Administration to prevent the further weaponization of space and to negotiate verifiable limits on U.S. and Soviet ASAT testing and deployment—limits that would be very much in the national security interest of the United States.

The Committee has cut back too drastically on funding for the Small ICBM (SICBM) or "Midgetman" missile, failing to adopt my motion to restore $450 million necessary to keep Midgetman on schedule. The effect of the cut will be to delay initial flight testing and deployment of the SICBM and could well have the long-term effect of killing the program. This decision makes no strategic sense and is contrary to the recommendations of the President's Commission on Strategic Forces (the Scowcroft Commission), which urged us to move away from MIRVed systems toward less lucrative targets in order to reduce the incentives of either side to strike first in a crisis. It makes far more sense to spend funds on strategic systems that enhance survivability and stability rather than on weapons, such as the MX, which do neither. The SICBM program is well managed and is proceeding satisfactorily. Air Force Secretary Aldridge has stated that "the small ICBM is truly an Air Force success story." We should not be slashing it as it comes to fruition.

TACTICAL NUCLEAR WEAPONS

In the area of tactical nuclear weapons, the Committee wisely elected to delete funding for further development of the Navy's SM-2N nuclear air defense weapon and anti-submarine warfare (ASW) "stand-off" weapon. I have long opposed development of these two new nuclear weapons on the grounds that the Navy has failed to demonstrate a convincing rationale for their military utility and because of my belief that they serve to lower, not raise, the nuclear threshold.

CONVENTIONAL FORCES

In the area of conventional weapons, the Committee once again expressed its strong support for several critical joint programs by adopting my proposed report language directing that no additional cuts be made in the JTACMs, JSTARs or Joint Tactical Fusion programs. These programs are important efforts to improve the effectiveness of our conventional military deterrent in the 1990s, and they deserve the full support of the Congress.

I was also pleased that the Committee adopted my amendment to restore production of the F-16 and F-18 fighter aircraft and AH-64 attack helicopter to levels that will allow us to retain more efficient production of these important weapons and reduce unit costs.

The Committee also correctly moved to restore full funds for various spare parts accounts. In deciding on priorities within the defense budget, the question the Congress must ask itself is: What will we need most if we have to go to war tomorrow?" Items like spare parts must not be cut to the detriment of overall combat capability, even in this time of severe budgetary constraints. It makes no sense to continue to purchase $40 million aircraft if we do not also maintain stockpiles of spare parts to keep those aircraft flying.

MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL ISSUES

On the issue of pay and benefits for our military personnel, I was pleased to see that the pay raise will be preserved and that the G.I. Bill test program will be protected. The committee has correctly recognized the importance of such benefits for the retention and morale of our military forces.

Last year, we de-linked the Army College Fund from the Services' Enlistment Bonus, thereby preventing a single recruit from receiving both. This decision has had an adverse effect on recruitment and retention patterns in the military. This year, we were asked to take it one step further and delink the G.I. Bill from the Enlistment Bonus as well. This would have meant that the same individual could not receive an enlistment cash bonus and also remain eligible for the G.I. Bill. Delinking the G.I. Bill from the Enlistment Bonus would constitute a major assault on the Armed Services' efforts to attract the highest quality recruits, and I am pleased that the committee adopted my amendment to prevent this from occurring.

LABOR AND CONTRACTING PROVISIONS

Finally, it is disappointing that the Committee has disregarded committee jurisdictional rules by including issues properly in the province of the Labor and Human Resources Committee.

It is erroneous for the majority to assert that the Davis-Bacon and Service Contract Act provisions can properly be dealt with by this Committee because they only apply to defense contracts. Had these measures been introduced as free standing legislation, they would have been referred to the Labor and Human Resources Committee, and the Parliamentarian has so ruled.

The action of the Committee is particularly inexplicable in light of the recent bipartisan stand taken by the committee in defending the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee against the instrusions of the Appropriations Committee. By legislating sweeping changes of labor law in the Armed Services Committee, the majority has greatly weakened its own right to protect its rightful jurisdiction against future intrusions. The background, legislative history, and workplace realities which led Congress to enact and maintain the prevailing wage standards protecting private-sector employees performing on government contracts are beyond the experience and expertise of this Committee, and they should be stricken from the bill.

Both the Davis-Bacon and Service Contract Acts ensure that the government does not use its purchasing power to depress area wages. This fundamental premise is as valid today as when Congress first enacted these statutes. Government contracts should not be awarded on the basis of exploitation nor should wage exploiters be rewarded with lucrative government contracts.

This Committee action will remove these protections for a vast number of working men and women performing services for the government and will return us to the cutthroat wage exploitation which existed in government contracting prior to the enactment of these statutes.

EDWARD M. KENNEDY

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. BINGAMAN

MEETING THE BUDGET TARGETS

The Committee has reported a budget which meets the $301 billion target for fiscal year 1987 defense budget authority set by the Senate in the budget resolution passed on May 1. But as I understand it, this bill is likely to be scored by the Congressional Budget Office at about $6 billion over the $282 billion fiscal year 1987 defense outlay target set in the Senate version of the budget resolution.

I do not have any short-term solution to this outlay-budget authority mismatch. I understand that there are some gimmicks around which could delay some fiscal year 1987 outlays into fiscal year 1988. The problem with such gimmicks is that they do not deal with the systemic problem that we continue to stuff more programs into the budget than we will efficiently be able to sustain in future years as we try to reduce our massive federal budget deficit. To the extent that the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings deficit reduction bill was intended to force us to make hard choices about the relative priority of various defense programs, that effort has failed.

The Committee has sustained the President's recommendation to cancel the T-46 and HH-60 programs, and the Committee did terminate the SH-2F ASW helicopter program which was in its last year of production in any case. But we also continued a large number of programs at inefficient production rates and we signed up for a series of new programs, each of which may make sense considered individually. But these new programs will consume enormously more money by the end of the decade, money we are unlikely to have available. To the extent that we continue to pretend that we will be able to afford everything we have underway, we will maximize the inefficiency in our defense spending when budgets will be tightest and we can least afford inefficiency.

BASE CLOSURES

It is not just in our weapons system production lines that inefficiency is rampant. As Senator Goldwater has pointed out, one can see it also in our military base structure. To try to get moving on dealing with this problem, Senator Thurmond and I recommended the establishment of a Presidential Blue Ribbon Task Group on Military Base Closures jointly appointed by the President and Congressional leaders, which will report by July 1987 on its recommendations for base closures. The Committee included that provision in the bill.

MEDICAL FACILITIES

The Committee also backed the Pentagon's decision to replace the current Brooke Army Medical Center with a 150-bed hospital, rather than the 450-bed hospital the Army had sought. When this action is considered along with last year's decision to scale back the size of the Madigan Army Medical Center, and the Air Force-Veterans Administration sharing arrangement negotiated this year in Albuquerque, New Mexico, we can see real progress toward rationalization of the DoD medical system, as recommended by the Blue Ribbon Panel on Hospital Sizing in its June 1985 report. Dr. William Mayer, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs, deserves real credit for bringing about effieciency in this area and freeing up resources for higher priority medical needs.

NAVY HOMEPORTING

But unfortunately, while the Committee was taking these positive actions on our base structure, it also approved by a 10-9 vote the opening of new naval homeports in Staten Island, New York, Everett, Washington, and in eight locations along the Gulf Coast. This was despite the analysis from our staff which indicated that placing the 47 ships involved in existing ports would cost $540 million less for military construction over the next five years and $250-$300 million less in annual operating and support costs than placing them in the new ports. Our staff's analysis also indicated that the strategic benefits of homeporting, if any, are marginal. With modern surveillance systems, there is little conventional threat to our ports and the chance of a repetition of Pearl Harbor at Norfolk, Charleston, and San Diego is remote indeed. Rather than fighting the last war, we should be devoting our limited resources to real needs. At a time when it is doubtful that we will be able to properly man and arm the 600-ship Navy, strategic homeporting is a luxury we must forego. I therefore plan to move to strike the funds for the Staten Island and Everett homeports when this bill comes to the floor.

BALANCED TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVE

I want to commend Senator Nunn for his leadership on the balanced technology initiative. While I have supported a vigorous strategic defense research effort carried out within the constraints of the traditional interpretation of the ABM Treaty, I have been concerned that that effort was mistaken in its focus on "space shield" population defenses and that it was also taking resources from high priority conventional research programs. As our report points out, the technology base's share of defense research funds has been constantly eroding since the mid-1960's and at an accelerating pace in recent years. In fiscal year 1986, we saw the DARPA budget gutted as SDI was shielded from the Gramm-Rudman cuts and from the undistributed cuts applied to the defense agencies' research account by the appropriations bill. Important programs such as strategic computing and seismic verification research were cut by up to 20 percent from the President's request. We need to restore balance among our research programs, and I am glad to be associated with Senator Nunn's effort to do so.

SECOND PENTAGON

I was also pleased to see the Committee refuse funds for the so-called second Pentagon, a 3,000,000 square foot office complex intended to be built in the current south parking lot of the Pentagon. Such a facility would have brought 18,500 additional military and civilian personnel to join the 30,000 already housed at the Pentagon and the Naval Annex. Since this growth and centralization of the headquarters bureaucracy ran counter to the Committee's whole effort on defense reorganization, I felt it was important to nip it in the bud.

TOBACCO PRICING POLICY

During the Committee's deliberations, I offered an amendment to raise the price of tobacco products in commissaries and exchanges to the prevailing level in the local community (or overseas to the average U.S. price, inclusive of state and local taxes). I proposed to place the $202 million in additional profits which I estimated my amendment would have raised in the welfare and recreation funds of the services to promote the health and fitness of service members and their families.

According to the March 1986 DoD report on Smoking and Health in the Military, smoking is far more prevalent among service members than in the population as a whole. This is especially true for younger service members. The DoD report also conservatively estimated that smoking added $210 million in direct health care costs in the military medical system in fiscal year 1984.

Despite this report, Secretary Weinberger chose not to bring tobacco prices in military commissaries and exchanges in line with those in the civilian sector. This means that the services will carry out anti-smoking campaigns while still encouraging smoking through their pricing policies. My amendment sought to end that contradiction in a way that was fairest to the military community. I was disappointed by the 11-7 vote against the amendment in Committee, but I do plan to pursue this issue further on the floor.

ALTERNATIVE PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

The Committee has taken a significant step toward implementing the Packard Commission's recommendations on improving the quality of DoD's scientific, technical, and acquisition personnel. It has been a pleasure to work with Senator Quayle, Chairman of the Acquisition Policy Subcommittee, on this issue.

Building on the foundation of the demonstration project at the China Lake Naval Weapons Center and the San Diego Naval Ocean Systems Center, we have sought to provide a flexible, performance-based alternative management system which could deal with the well-documented problems DoD is having in recruiting and retaining top-quality people in these professions. We have provided the flexibility to implement the alternative system either organization by organization or occupation by occupation within the DoD acquisition and research structure.

We have provided some needed relief from the civil service pay cap for a small percentage of individuals under the alternative system. And we have constrained the implementation of the alternative system to be cost neutral compared to retention of the existing system. This will force managers to make what David Packard has termed a quality-quantity trade-off. To the extent they want to reward their top performers, managers will have to shrink the size of their workforce, a streamlining which the Packard Commission believes is needed in any case.

COMMITTEE LEADERSHIP

Let me conclude by remarking on how well served the Senate is by the Chairman and the Ranking Member of this Committee. During this Congress Senators Goldwater and Nunn have provided tremendous leadership on a whole range of issues. In his brief tenure as Chairman, Senator Goldwater has left an indelible mark on our defense establishment. He has fought valiantly to streamline our defense orgainzation, to eliminate defense waste and inefficiency, to obtain the resources for defense which he felt were required, and to provide for the strongest possible defense for this nation within the resources ultimately allocated for that purpose. He has conducted the Committee with a keen sense of fairness and, together with Senator Nunn, has sought bipartisan solutions to difficult issues whenever possible. The Committee will sorely miss Senator Goldwater next year, but we will look forward to him talking as bluntly on the issues in retirement as he did as the leader of our Committee.

JEFF BINGAMAN.

○